

SEAL IS PLACED ON ELK LAKE TELEGRAM

SIR JAMES WHITNEY DECLINES TO MAKE A STATEMENT AS TO AUTHORSHIP.

Legislature Censures Senate for Throwing Out Subsidy for Temiskaming & Northern Ontario Railway — Liberals Suggest That Application be Renewed With Objectionable Clauses Removed.

With the session of the Legislature scheduled to close to-day, rapid-fire changes were run in on the final hours yesterday afternoon, and, under the pressure of time, amendments, divisions and sharp exchanges between the leaders followed each other in rapid succession. Resolutions were adopted protesting against the action of the Senate in throwing out the bills for the T. & N. O. subsidy and highway aid for the Province.

The former resolution, by Mr. W. S. Brewster (South Brant), was objected to by the Opposition on account of the wording as not likely to produce good results on another application for the subsidy at Ottawa. Mr. Proudfoot's amendment approved the principle of granting subsidies to Provincial railways, and of the action of both the former and the present Provincial Governments in applying to Ottawa for aid, and held that the objections to granting the subsidy would be removed if the proceeds were devoted towards extending the railway, and suggested that the Government should renew its application.

Censure of Senate.

The resolution of Mr. Arthur Grigg (Algoma) in respect of the highway grant expressed "indignation and deep regret" that the popular will had been overridden by the partisan action of the Senate. An amendment moved by Mr. W. E. N. Sinclair (South Ontario) declared that the grants to the several Provinces should be on a fixed basis, and regretted that the Federal Government declined to accept that principle. This motion was lost on a vote of 71 to 19.

The Elk Lake telegram again occupied the limelight, and the Prime Minister could not be drawn into making a statement as to its authorship.

Mr. Rowell read from a return of correspondence and reports in connection with the Elk Lake extension. He quoted from reports by the Engineer of the Commission dealing unfavorably with the route from Earleton to Elk Lake, which had been decided upon later.

As recently as two weeks before the election the Chairman of the Commission wrote a letter stating that the route of the extension would be held in abeyance until the route from South Porcupine had been investigated, so that the Commission could make a comparison with the Earleton-Charlton route. In the face of that statement there must have been a sudden change to warrant the announcement two days before the election that the branch would be built from Earleton. Perhaps the exigencies of the Government candidate in that riding prompted it.

Refuses Point-blank.

Going over the circumstances again, Mr. Rowell said that the Prime Minister ought to state to the House whether he sent the telegram purporting to be signed by him in answer to that he had received.

James charged that Mr. Row-

ell all through the discussion had held back the fact that he had received a telegram himself. "Now my hon. friend says that before this clause passes I should do something. I will tell my hon. friend that if this clause never passes I will not do it."

"Whenever we propose doing a good thing for the people we will make a point of telling the people about it, no matter whether there is an election on or not," concluded Sir James.

Mr. Rowell expressed himself entirely in accord with the view that the subsidy should be granted. He believed both Provincial Governments had been right in pressing for the subsidy. He thought Mr. Proudfoot's amendment preferable to Mr. Brewster's motion. He thought if the facts of the case were properly put before the Senate it might change its mind. It was not wise to go after it with a club.

Mr. Rowell's Position.

Sir James Whitney asked Mr. Rowell if he would support the Brewster resolution if the word "partisan" was omitted. Mr. Rowell replied that he would if certain debatable words were dropped, and suggested that "unjust and partisan" be left out, but Sir James thought without this expression the resolution would be of no use. They were not there to approve of the action of the Government at Ottawa.

He charged that Mr. Rowell had found a loophole in the suggestion that the matter may not have been properly put before the Senate. That was the slender thread on which he hung his objection. He did not recall the names of the previous T. & N. O. Commission. "But one of them is Robert Jaffray. Now Robert Jaffray is a very estimable man. He is one of the celebrated six, and is a co-director of my hon. friend (Mr. Rowell) on The Toronto Globe. Does my hon. friend expect us to believe that this Senator, who was present and cast his vote against the subsidy, refrained improperly from telling the members of the Senate what he knew—namely, that an application had been made? Either the Senate was not in possession of the facts, or, if that was not so, Senator Jaffray did not reveal to them what he knew to be a fact. It is one way or the other, and my hon. friend will have to admit that no case has been made out that the Senate did not know anything about the facts."

Offensive to Liberals.

Mr. Proudfoot referred to the unfortunate wording of Mr. Brewster's motion. The House was being called upon to pass in judgment upon the High Court of Parliament. As long as partisan appointments were made to the Senate they should not pass judgment upon it. He resented the attack Mr. Brewster had made upon Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and said in the face of that no Liberal could be expected to support the resolution. No more absurd statement was ever made than attributing the action of the Senate to Sir Wilfrid's hatred of