

hanger-on is given a considerable advance, nearly three per cent advance on the old figures that were given before. I go into the same department and what do I find again? I asked the following question:

1. Who is the postmaster at Waverley, Ontario?

2. Does he personally conduct the office?

3. Does he reside at the post office premises? If not, how far therefrom?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General):

1. Mr. John Anderson.

2 and 3. The department has no information as to whether the postmaster personally conducts the office or resides at the post office premises or elsewhere.

Is that not a beautifully conducted department? They appoint a man as postmaster and they do not know where he lives. He might live in Timbuctoo for all the department knows. And what are the facts of the case? A party hanger-on is appointed postmaster of the town, and he does not live within three miles of the village. There are three stores in the village, and the postmaster appointed is to-day studying in his own mind to which of the stores he is going to put the post office in.

That will depend on the amount of remuneration they are prepared to pay the Postmaster for having it there. The government might better sell the privilege of conducting the post office. They could get \$100 a year from any one of these three storekeepers, but the reason that some of these storekeepers cannot have the post office is that they are Tories. It was taken out of the store of one of them, a man who had been postmaster for years without complaint, without any demur having been made at all, this farmer who lives three miles away and night and day is on the beat for hon. gentlemen opposite, is appointed postmaster, and to-day he is dickering with these three storekeepers as to what each is prepared to pay for the privilege of having the post office in his store. It is a matter of public comment there, and they are tossing up to see who is going to have the post office in his store. This is a fair sample of how matters are conducted in that riding, and if the condition of affairs in other ridings were inquired into it would be found to be exactly the same. Why is it so? It is because certain things are tolerated in this House and in the country that the ordinary grafter thinks he ought to have some of it too. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) does what? He gives \$3,000 or \$4,000 worth of timber on an island to a party hanger-on, a member of this House steers the deal through the department and the brother of the member gets \$50 for his services although his name never appears in this connection at all. That is the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Grant). The case was before the House on a former

occasion. This same thing is going on all through the Dominion in the interest of the grafters and hangers on of the party whose attention has now been transferred from Toronto to Ottawa in connection with schemes of this kind. I am going to believe the minister's statement. I am not going to believe Mr. Keyes' statement—I care not whether Mr. Keyes is offended or not—when Mr. Keyes says that his statement was an error in saying that the contract had been signed. Some one told his honour the Speaker that the contract had been signed and it is the duty of the House to give an opportunity to his honour the Speaker to inform the House if he can, whether or not a contract had been signed. Until I hear more I am not prepared to accept Mr. Keyes' statement now that he blundered, that he made a mistake when he wrote these gentlemen that there was no contract and that when you, Mr. Speaker, went to the department and saw Mr. Keyes, he committed another blunder and was guilty of another falsehood by informing you that there was a contract signed.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And informed the Prime Minister later.

Mr. BENNETT. And informed the Prime Minister later. It is crime upon crime. It is a very fortunate thing that we have some active business men in this country like the Page Wire Fence Company, prepared to intervene when a scheme like this is being put through, because it might not have been brought before the House but for the timely intervention of those gentlemen and the information which they have given to my hon. friend from West Kent (Mr. Clements). If some of our hon. friends are willing to lay all kinds of crimes and misdemeanours at the door of the Department of the Interior, I will say to them that that department has not a monopoly of them. We have these dredging matters to which I am going to refer again and I may say that only a day or two since I got some information about another dredging plant. Who own these dredging plants throughout Ontario to-day? Are they practical contractors? Not one of them. Hangers-on, political judges and I am going to say to the House that in order to mislead and to delude the public a fraud is resorted to in making returns to the department at Toronto as to who the stockholders of these companies are. This is to cover up their tracks, and yet the hon. acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) the other day got up here and asked the House and myself to accept his statement that he did not know that Mr. McKay, of Owen Sound, was interested in a dredge and that Mr. McKay had never sent him notice of it. We all know that Mr. McKay is considerable of a traveller both on land and sea. We know that Mr. McKay's primary business in coming to Ottawa must be to see whether or