THE LEGISLATURE.

Mr. Fowler on Public Accounts Committee Meeting.

Mr. Barnes and His Connection With the Cocagne Bridge Matter.

The Corornors Inquest Bill—Mr. Poirer the New Member for Gloucester Introduced.

FREDERICTON, March 5.—Mr. Howe made his inquiry for particulars as to the diseased animals in the recent stock importation.

Hon. Mr. Labillois answered the several questions as follows:

Q.—How many animals of the recent stock importation made by the government were found to be affected with tuberculosis or otherwise diseased? A.—Ten animals were purchased from one man, and shipped by him without being tested, contrary to bargain and instructions. Seven out of the ten reacted under the tuberculin test.

Q.—How many of said animals were slaughtered, and upon whose recommendation. A.—Seven, by the owner, Mr. Reburn.

Q.—What veterinary surgeon or surgeons examined and reported on the diseased animals, and was such report in writing? If not, what was the nature of the report? A.—The tuberculin test was applied by Dr. Henry of Fredericton. He reported that seven out of the ten animals reacted over two degrees, as per his written report on file in the department of agriculture.

Q.—What arrangement was made with Mr. Reburn in connection with the said animals, or any of them, and what amount of money was paid to Mr. Reburn by the government or any department thereof, and for what? A.—It was agreed to send the seven animals back and prepay the freight. The freight charges and the cost of attendant there and back was estimated to cost $100. After this had been done Mr. Reburn elected to accept the $100 in lieu of freight charges and slaughter the animals here.

Mr. Howe, in the absence of Mr. Pinder, made the latter's motion with reference to particulars as to the construction of permanent bridges.

Hon. Mr. Emmerson said the information would be furnished without the formality of an address.

Mr. Stockton said he would move that his notice of motion, asking that the public accounts committee be authorized to call for persons and papers in connection with the banking operations of the government, stand over till Monday. If this were not acceded to, of course he could withdraw the motion and give a new motion. One reason why he desired the motion to stand over was that several hon. members were absent.

Hon. Mr. Emmerson said he thought the matter should be proceeded with now. Assuming that it was to be taken up today, some hon. members had remained in attendance upon the house at great inconvenience to themselves. Of course the hon. gentleman could withdraw his motion if he was not prepared to go on, and give a new motion as suggested.

Dr. Stockton said he did not wish to withdraw the motion, and rather than do so he would give the government a chance to vote it down.

Hon. Mr. White said the hon. leader of the opposition should know that under the rules of the house a motion of which notice had been given, if not taken up at the time for which it was fixed, must lapse.

Mr. Speaker—Under the rules a motion not taken up in its proper time would be dropped. But the hon. gentleman, with the unanimous consent of the house, could have it placed on the orders of the day for another day.

Dr. Stockton said his object in not withdrawing the motion and giving a new notice was to save time.

Hon. Mr. Emmerson said that several hon. gentlemen who had remained over expecting the motion to come up would be absent on Monday, and some who were now away would not be here before Wednesday. If the hon. leader of the opposition was unwilling or not ready to go on with the motion now he (Emmerson) would be quite willing not to require him (Stockton) to withdraw the motion, and would agree to have the matter stand over till Tuesday.

Dr. Stockton said that would be perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. Mott presented a report from the committee on corporations.

Mr. Russell committed a bill to amend chap. 102, Con. Stats., settlement of the poor, Mr. Legere chairman.

Progress reported with leave.

Hon. Mr. White committed a bill in further amendment of act 53rd Victoria, chap. 4, entitled an act respecting practice and proceedings in the supreme court in equity, Mr. Russell chairman. Agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Tweedie submitted returns of receipts, checks received by the receiver general, and warrants issued from November 1st, 1897, till February 9th, 1898.

Mr. Mott committed a bill further relating to the town of Campbellton, Mr. Fowler chairman. Bill was under consideration at six o'clock, when committee took recess.

After recess the bill amending the act incorporating the town of Campbellton was further considered in committee of the whole.

Hon. Mr. Emmerson said he was opposed to sections 17, 20 and 21, which, while they might be said to be following previous legislation as respects St. John, Fredericton and other places, really went further than that legislation and introduced a new element which might hereafter be cited as a precedent, and he wished to place himself on record against the sections.

After a general discussion, in which Mr. Mott stood by the sections, the house passed sections 20 and 21.

Section 17 stood for further consideration.

Progress was reported with leave to sit again.

Mr. Black introduced a bill to incorporate the bishop and chapter of Christ church cathedral, Fredericton, Mr. Venoit in the chair.

Progress was reported with leave to sit again.

Hon. Mr. Richard committed a bill to enable the county council of Westmorland to sell and convey certain lands in the parish of Salisbury held for school purposes, Mr. Barnes in the chair. Agreed to with amendments.

Mr. Fowler committed a bill to incorporate the Provincial Coal Co., Mr. Smith in the chair. Progress was reported.—Adjourned.

FREDERICTON, March 7.—Mr. Fowler rose to a question of privilege. He had noticed in the St. John Sun what purported to be a report of the doings of the public accounts committee on Saturday last. That report was entirely erroneous.

Mr. Sumner—I claim the right of reply.

Hon. Mr. Tweedie—Do you claim the right of reply whether what he states is correct or not?

Mr. Sumner—No, only if he is out of line with my ideas.

Mr. Fowler said it would appear by the report as though a disposition had been shown by himself as chairman of the public accounts committee to shut out the investigation of the various items of expenditure in the accounts. On the contrary the desire shown by every member of the committee was that all the accounts that came before them should be most thoroughly investigated. When the committee met on Saturday the hon. member for Westmorland (Sumner) had said that he would prefer that the committee should not sit owing to the absence of Mr. Pinder. He (Fowler) had then stated that the meeting on Friday had been adjourned because of the absence of the hon. member for York, and that as it was the intention to get through with the work of the session as rapidly as possible the committee must bring in its report in ample time so that it might be discussed in the house. The hon. member for Westmorland had then stated that he would withdraw from the committee. He (Fowler) said this was very strange conduct in view of the necessity of getting through with the work as soon as possible, and in view of the fact that the previous day's session had been postponed to suit the convenience of the hon. member for York (Pinder). He had never said, as stated in the Sun, that all the business of the committee must be got through with at that session of the committee. He had not got down from his high horse in any respect that he was aware of, as stated in the report, but on the contrary had told Mr. Sumner that a quorum could be had by calling in the provincial secretary. The committee then went on with its business, and various items were taken up and disposed of, and the committee adjourned at its usual hour. The report in the Sun was really inconsistent with itself, because in one part it insinuated that he had been guilty of gross partisanship and in another part it intimates that he (Fowler) was attacking the chief commissioner for the management of his department.

Mr. Sumner said he would agree to a certain extent with the statement of the hon. member for Kings.

Hon. Mr. Emmerson—I do not think this can be debated.

Dr. Stockton—The hon. member for Westmorland (Sumner) is a member of the public accounts committee and equally entitled to rise to a question of privilege.

Hon. Mr. Emmerson—If the hon. member is entitled to speak the whole house has a right to speak. The hon. member for Kings simply referred to a matter in the newspapers reflecting upon his conduct.

Mr. Sumner said that when the hon. member for Kings addressed the house it was understood that he (Sumner) should have the right to reply. He might state, however, that he had a resolution to move before he sat down. If the hon. member only meant to contradict the statement that he (Fowler) had come down from the high horse he (Sumner) would admit that that was correct and sit down.

Mr. Fowler—It is immaterial to me whether the hon. member sits down, stands up, or stands on his head. (Laughter).

Mr. Sumner—Well, I think the hon. member would require assistance to stand me on my head. (Laughter). It may have been that the matter was stated a little strongly in the paper. He might say that he did ask the chairman to have the committee adjourned because several members were absent, namely Mr. Pinder, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Dibblee and the provincial secretary.

Mr. Fowler—Mr. Dibblee was there and the provincial secretary was there.

Mr. Sumner—Well, he was not there at the time the question arose. I think the hon. member will admit that he said a great deal of time had been lost, and that he proposed to rush things through that morning.

Mr. Osman—No, he said he was anxious to get through with the work so that the report could be presented to the house before the close of the session.

Mr. Sumner said he thought the statement in the Sun was practically correct except so far as it refersed to the hon. member coming down from his high horse.

Mr. Fowler—There was no change of procedure whatever. We simply went on with the business and did all we could.

Mr. Sumner—Yes, I admit that I do not think the facts warranted the use of the language in the paper. Then I think you said that the committee last year was dissatisfied with the bills of the chief commissioner.

Mr. Fowler—No, I did not state that.

Mr. Sumner said he would admit that the present chairman (Fowler) was very fair in regard to matters that came before the committee, and a great improvement over his predecessors. When anything questionable was brought fairly before his eyes he would generally take exception to it.

Hon. Mr. Tweedie—Where is your motion?

Mr. Sumner—I may say that in the turmoil I had forgotten my motion. I would move that the house do now adjourn.

The clouds have hardly held more rain drops than the tears which have fallen from women's eyes. There is a world of truth in the old song which said: "Man must work, and woman must weep." Women must weep not only for the troubles and ills of those they love, but because of the physical agony and suffering that they themselves endure in silence.

Nine-tenths of the pain and suffering that women undergo could be avoided by a little knowledge, and a resort to the right remedy. When a woman feels weak, sick, nervous, fretful and despondent, and suffers from pains in the back and sides, and burning and dragging down sensations, she is suffering from weakness and disease of the distinctly feminine organism. Dr. Pierce's Favorite Prescription is the best of all medicines for ailing women. It acts directly and only on the delicate and important organs that make maternity possible. It makes them strong and well. It allays inflammation, heals ulceration, soothes pain, and tones the nerves. It does away with the usual discomforts of the timorous period, and makes baby's coming easy and almost painless. It is the discovery of Dr. R. V. Pierce, an eminent and skillful specialist, for thirty years chief consulting physician to the Invalids' Hotel and Surgical Institute, at Buffalo, N. Y. No honest dealer will urge a substitute for this superior medicine.

"I cannot say too much for Dr. Pierce's Favorite Prescription," writes Miss Clara Baird, of Bridgeport, Montgomery Co., Pa. "I cannot praise it too highly for the good it did me. If any one doubts this give them my name and address."

Send for Dr. Pierce's Common Sense Medical Adviser. Paper-bound, 31 one-cent stamps; cloth-bound, 50 cents. Address Dr. R. V. Pierce, Buffalo, N. Y.

Mr. Barnes said he would crave the indulgence of the house in order to make an explanation upon a matter of privilege.

Mr. Speaker—Are you speaking upon the hon. member's motion?

Mr. Barnes—Yes; I would second the motion.

Mr. Barnes said that a few days ago the hon. member for York (Pinder) in the course of a lengthy speech had made a personal attack upon him in reference to the Cocaigne bridge. Perhaps he should not be surprised at this, because he was told that the hon. member was subject to nightmare, and doubtless this was only a recurrence of what took place when the hon. member was speaking through the country. The hon. member had stated that the Cocagne bridge investigation had brought to light the important fact that "an account for $203 was shown the committee, when the man in whose name the account was made up states that he charged only $50 and was only paid that amount, and he knows nothing about this $203." I would ask the hon. member if that was the language he used?

Mr. Pinder—Well, it is pretty close to it; I accept that as my language.

Mr. Barnes said that he had at the investigation sworn solemnly that he paid that amount of $207.50 for towage. If he left the remarks of the hon. member for York (Pinder) go unchallenged he would be branded throughout the length and breadth of the country as a thief and perjurer. He did not wish his name to go down to posterity as a man who had pilfered and filched from the public treasury. He held in his hand the sworn affidavit of James D. Irving of Buctouche, to whom the payment referred to was made. While some of the hon. members of the opposition, including its leader, had always used him (Barnes) fairly there were others whose only stock in trade was slander and misrepresentation. The leader of the opposition had told him (Barnes) in conversation that he absolved him from all blame in connection with the matter and that he would withdraw the charge, but he was unable to do so. He would place the following sworn statement against the bald and bold slanders made against himself by the hon. member for York:

I, James D. Irving of Buctouche, in the county of Kent, and province of New Brunswick, merchant, do solemnly declare as follows:

That I am the J. D. Irving mentioned and set forth in the bill or account for towage hereto annexed, marked "A."

That I am the sole owner of the tugboat "Alice," which said tugboat was engaged during the season of A. D. 1893 in the towage of a number of cedar logs in rafts from the rafting boom in the Buctouche River, in the county of Kent, to the Cocagne bridge, on the Cocagne River, in said county, for which towage and the expenses incurred therein I charged the sum of $207.50.

That I did on or about the third day of August, A. D. 1894, render to Mr. James Barnes, member of parliament for the said county the annexed bill or account for said towage made out to the department board of works and received from the said Mr. Barnes the sum of two hundred and seven dollars and fifty cents in payment of said bill or account.

That I do not consider the above charge for said towage an exorbitant one, but verily believe the same to be a fair, just and reasonable charge for the work, labor and expense incurred in the said towage, and I make this solemn declaration conscientiously, believing the same to be true and knowing it to be of the same effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada evidence, 1893.

(Signed.) JAMES D. IRVING,

Declared at Buctouche, in the County of Kent, this first day of March, A. D. 1898, before me,

(Signed.) ROBERT A. IRVING,

A commissioner for taking affidavits to be read in the Supreme Court.

Mr. Barnes, continuing, said that he had taken some pains to investigate the record of the hon. member for York (Pinder). He had found in looking through some of the old auditor general's reports some information that was most damaging to the hon. member. At the same time he would not condemn the hon. member without giving him ample opportunity to reply. He found that in 1873 Warrant No. 36 had been issued to the hon. member for $77.50 and no account rendered. Would the hon. member kindly give us an account of that amount.

Mr. Pinder—Give us the rest of it and I will answer you.

Mr. Barnes said that in 1876 Warrant No. 32 had been issued to the hon. gentleman for $50—no voucher. In the same year Warrant No. 40 had been issued for $100—no voucher. In 1878 Warrant No. 27—no voucher; for the sum of $294.37. In the same year Warrant No. 47 for $50—no voucher. In the same year Warrant No. 52, for $100—no voucher. In 1879 Warrant No. 49, for $40—no voucher; and in 1885 Warrant 14, for $60—no voucher. Making in all $671.87, which, deducting the amounts over-expended, amounting to $27.91, left a sum of $643.96 which the hon. member had received from the government, and for which he had rendered no account.

Mr. Pinder—I can explain the whole of it.

Mr. Barnes said that for the information of the house he would read what the auditor general had to say on this subject:

AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE,
FREDERICTON, March 4, 1898.

I have carefully examined the returns made by bye-road commissioners filed in this office and as stated in the auditor general's report since the yerr 1878 and cannot find any account of return in any way effecting the correctness of the annexed statement.

JAMES S. BEEK,
Auditor General.

Dr. Stockton—What, has the auditor general been giving statements of that kind to private members?

Mr. Barnes, continuing, said that the hon. member for York (Pinder) certainly took a great deal of interest in his country's welfare. Besides performing large service for the provincial administration, from time to time he figured extensively in the dominion accounts for the year 1893, when he worked as day laborer upon a certain public work known as Bear Island bar, at one-fifty per day, while his son enjoyed the position of foreman at $2 a day. Mr. Barnes gave a list of the persons employed on the work, remarking that they were mostly friends and neighbors of the hon. member for York. There was charged for this work in the year named $946.65, and it was said that the bar was still there. It was suggested that the work must have been done under water, for the men said to be employed were scarcely ever seen there at work.

Dr. Alward rose to a point of order. The hon. member (Barnes) should not be allowed to travel back into ancient history, still less take up the time of the house with matters pertaining to the dominion legislature, and not this house. He would insist upon a ruling.

Mr. Speaker—The hon. member is speaking to a motion to adjourn the house. I cannot possibly know what the hon. member is coming at.

Mr. Pinder—He has got on Bear Island bar and has got stuck there. (Laughter.)

Mr. Barnes said he would ask the house whether the hon. member for York had ever in all the years he represented the county ever formulated any original scheme or anything that would benefit the province? On the contrary, the hon. member had simply been a fault-finder and had shown great economy with the truth. The hon. member was to be found at all times hiding his light and in his nocturnal rambles looking for matter that was putrid and filthy—dug up from the garbage heap of provincial politics. This was the matter that he threw at the government and their supporers. As long as the hon. gentleman persisted in that course, he (Barnes) could not meet him as one gentleman should meet another. He had devoted some attention to the hon. member's record, because he wished the country to know the source from which these slanders had emanated.

Mr. Pinder said he did not propose to go at length into this subject of the Bear Island bar. He had not got more than half paid for the work he did there. As for the amounts the hon. member had raked up from the old auditor general's reports, that matter had all been throughly threshed out in this house as well as in the country. If the hon. member would visit the various localities where the money was expended, he would find that it was well expended and the work well done. In his references to the Cocagne bridge the other day, he had not mentioned the hon. member (Barnes) by name. As to the contract for cedars, he had stated what was true, that the contract was given to a defeated candidate just after the close of an election. With regard to the amount paid for towage, he said then, and he would say now, that he believed $57 was Mr. William Irving's charge for towing that raft, and that was all he got. Jas. D. Irving was another man altogether. He did not say where the money went, and did not know. What he said was that it cost only $50 to tow the raft, and it turned out to be $57. Mr. Barnes might have paid James D. Irving $207. If he did, he paid more than he had any business to pay. The transaction of getting these cedars and handling them was a disgrace to the government. The work was done years before it was paid for, and only paid for because of some kicking that was done at the session of the legislature. He would ask the hon. member who was the man that owned the tug boat?

Mr. Barnes—James D. Irving.

Mr. Pinder—Well, the man that run the boat was William Irving, and he only received $57, and he said as soon as he found out that $207 was paid that he was coming up here to see about it. More than that, the bill before the committee was not receipted as paid, but left open. What interest had Mr. Barnes, as representative for Kent, that he should be sent over to bring witnesses, and then charge the county for doing so? He would repeat that all the cedar the government got was 850 pieces, and they cost the province about $1,700 or $1,800, or something like $5 a thousand. If any hon. gentleman opposite really wanted to know something about the Bear Island bar, he (Pinder) would be glad to take the time to show it to him. The people in the vicinity were well satisfied with the way the work had been done.

Dr. Stockton said one statement had been made by the hon. member for Kent that astonished him, namely, that it was possible for a private member to get to the auditor general and get such a certificate with reference to the public accounts as the hon. member had read to this house. Was it possible that the government directed the auditor general to give information to members supporting the government that was denied to members on this side of the house? Wasn't the auditor general there to give information to every member of the house? Yet it would appear that private members supporting the government were able to get to that official and get certificates with reference to public accounts that were twenty and twenty-five years old, while if any member in opposition went there it would be refused. If the auditor general was under the control of the government to that extent, it was well that the country should know it. There was information with reference to the finances of this country which the opposition wanted all the session and which was only brought down last Saturday. With reference to the charge that the hon. member for York (Pinder) had rendered no vouchers or accounts, the auditor's report for this year or any year showed that dozens and dozens of amounts had been paid for which no accounts were furnished. It would be well for the government to give their attention to having these accounts brought in, instead of going back twenty-five years. He (Stockton) had pointed out an item of $35 in Sunbury county, for which no account had been rendered. Why were these public servants permitted to get this money without sending in their accounts? If the government were attentive to their duty these accounts would be in, so that the house would have the information. With reference to the expenditure upon Bear Island bar, that was being continually dragged into the debates of this house. Dr. Stockton said he had taken occasion to look into the matter himself over a year ago, and what did he find? He found that the hon. member (Pinder) had expended thousands of dollars for the dominion government, that the work was well and faithfully performed, and that all he and his son received was $500 or $600. Surely $1.50 a day was not an exorbitant figure. With reference to the charge or insinuation that money had been paid for services never rendered, the house had an instance of that in the case of the Suspension bridge, where it was proved that men were put upon the pay roll who were never there at all, and not a step had since been taken by the government to recover the money improperly paid. It seemed to him that the government should take some action to get back that money which the commissioner in his report said had been improperly paid. This was a little more modern than transactions that had taken place in 1873. The statement the hon. member for Kent had made as to getting a certificate from the auditor general was one of the most extraordinary performances he had ever known on the floors of this house. If members supporting the opposition wanted any information they would have to give two days' notice of motion.

Hon. Mr. Emmerson said he had thought during the past few days that the mantle of the leader of the opposition had fallen on the hon. member for Westmorland (Sumner). He was glad to see that the hon. member from St. John (Stockton) was back in the harness and that he felt he had some responsibility in connection with the affairs of the province. The matter brought up by the hon. member for Kent (Barnes) certainly had arisen apart from him (Emmerson). It arose apparently out of a charge hurled across the floors of the house by the hon. member for York (Pinder) as against the good name and reputation of the hon. member for Kent, and the latter had done wisely in placing himself right. It was true that the hon. member for York (Pinder) had not made any direct charge, but by insinuation he wished the people of this country to believe that the hon. member for Kent had been guilty of some offence against the public treasury. The hon. member for York had talked about the Bear island bar, but he had not dealt with his default with reference to the public works mentioned in the auditor general's report. He (Emmerson) was not disposed to assume that because no account had been rendered therefor there was anything wrong about it, but when the hon. gentlemen opposite repeatedly made charges of wrong-doing against the government and their supporters because the words "no account" appeared opposite many of these items in the auditor general's report, they ought not to complain if they were asked to take some of the same medicine.

Mr. Pinder—I did not explain these matters. I said that the various amounts drawn by me up to 1885 were properly expended, and that the whole matter had been threshed out. At that time I was a councillor, and the money got for me was handed over to others to expend upon the road. The work was satisfactorily done in every particular, and I am willing today to have any of these matters investigated.

Hon. Mr. Emmerson said that the other day the leader of the opposition had strongly condemned the government because of an item of $35 down in Sunbury.

Dr. Stockton—I mentioned that in answer to a statement made by the hon. member for Sunbury, who stated that every dollar there had been expended. I knew the statement was incorrect from information I had.

Hon. Mr. Emmerson—No, the hon. member for Sunbury (Morrow) was appealed to with reference to an expenditure upon Oromocto bridge, and there was no reference made to these by-road expenditures.

Dr. Stockton—No, the hon. member said all the money was expended in Sunbury.

Hon. Mr. Emmerson said the hon. member (Stockton) was attempting to dodge the issue because he knew the lame position he was in. The hon. member certainly attempted to create a prejudice in the minds of the people of the country—that there was some wrong-doing on the part of the government because the words "no account" appear opposite the names of certain parties entrusted with expenditures. He (Emmerson) had then explained to the house that men were appointed commissioners by the councils; that they sent in representations to the amount required; that the bond was made out, and when the bond came back to the department signed and executed the cheque was sent forward to the commissioner; and that the government could not follow him up to see that the money was expended. He had no reason to suppose that the money was not in almost every instance properly expended. He had a right to assume that it was properly expended until it was shown to the contrary. The mere fact that these accounts often came in late was no reason why suspicions of wrong-doing should be entertained. The hon. leader of the opposition had claimed that the money improperly expended in the Suspension bridge matter should be collected. His reply to that was that in a matter of $60 or $70, where the testimony was conflicting, he did not feel it was wise, as head of the department, to spend hundreds of dollars in the effort to have the money refunded. As to the auditor general, he wished to say that he was an official that he (Emmerson) had in no way sought to control.

Dr. Stockton—Will you say to the auditor general that he can give me information if I go there and ask for it?

Hon. Mr. Emmerson—My hon. friend need not ask me any such questions. My hon. friend is in this position—that the government have requested the auditor general to do in one instance what they would not have him to do in another. I state most distinctly and unqualifiedly that I never directly or indirectly had any communication with the auditor general with reference to the matter raised by the hon. member for Kent. It is clear, according to the auditor's reports, that the hon. member for York (Pinder) stands in default before the country for upwards of $600.

Dr. Stockton—Do you say that all parties in the auditor's report opposite whose names there is no account are defaulters?

Hon. Mr. Emmerson—The same remark I made as to the hon. member for York applies to them all. But, as I have already said, we have no right to assume because no account appears that any person has really committed any wrong.

Hon. Mr. Tweedie said the hon. leader of the opposition had sought to make a charge against members of the government that they had authorized the auditor general to furnish information that they would not allow to be furnished to others. He (Tweedie) would make the matter clear. Mr. Barnes had come to him with a statement that he said was taken from the reports, and he (Tweedie) had said that he ought to be careful about it and not to make a statement that was not correct. He (Tweedie) had said it was an old account, and had suggested that he see the auditor general, to see whether the accounts had not been filed. He (Tweedie) had never seen the auditor and his advice was given in the interest of the hon. member for York.

Dr. Alward—Will you allow me to look at that statement?

Dr. Stockton—I claim that the hon. member cannot read a paper without it becoming the property of the house.

Hon. Mr. Emmerson, continuing, said that the significant feature in connection with the matter was that from 1873 to 1885 the hon. member for York was a commissioner entrusted with the expenditure of public moneys, and it appeared that he never at any subsequent time up to the present moment sent in any of the accounts or returns called for to be incorporated in the auditor's report. The gentleman who was in that position should be very careful indeed as respects the charges which he made, not merely against hon. members on the floors of the house, but as against those who were filling public positions throughout the country. As far as the Bear island bar was concerned, the hon. leader of the opposition appeared to have constituted himself a committee of inquiry to exonerate the hon. member for York. If hon. members opposite would persist in their attempts to injure the good names of hon. members on this side of the house they must expect to be met by such evidence as had been produced here by the hon. member for Kent.

Dr. Alward said the government had repeatedly challenged the fullest investigation into all matters connected with their administration. Yet, when the questions were asked as to certain matters or things, they took umbrage, and instead of meeting the inquiry fairly and furnishing the proper information, they resorted to a species of tu queque argument. What under heavens had the Bear island bar to do with provincial administration when the opposition sought to get information with respect to the finances of the province, they were referred to transactions which had occurred over a quarter of a century ago, or matters with which the province had nothing to do. The hon. premier had charged the hon. member for York with being a defaulter. But when challenged on this side of the house to prove how he was a defaulter, the hon. member did not answer the question at all.

Hon. Mr. Emmerson—I said that in the face of the auditor's reports he was a defaulter, but I would not assume without further evidence that any man was a defaulter because he had rendered no account. But I said it was a significant fact that in all these years, from 1873 down to the present time, no accounts had ever been rendered for any expenditure made by the hon. member for York.

Dr. Alward said if the hon. member for York was a defaulter there were many defaulters in this country, for the reports were bristling with names of parties who had never sent in their returns. The hon. member for Kent had sought to create an impression of wrong doing on the part of the hon. member for York in regard to the Bear island bar, but what evidence had he produced? He had simply given the names of parties who had been paid so much a day for their services, and did not attempt to show that there was any wrong doing. Would the hon. member say that these were overcharges? The hon. member had said that the hon. member for York had employed his friends and neighbors. Was not the government doing this every day with respect to their public works?

Hon. Mr. White said that rule to which reference had been made, while it applied to documents read by ministers of the crown, did not apply to papers or documents read by private members. The matter was fully dealt with on page 410 of Bourinot.

Dr. Stockton said that the case of