

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You only account for \$15,000. You ask us to vote \$25,000, and you don't say what the other \$10,000 is for. It is a subject which one does not care to discuss very much, but the hon. gentleman will see that the amount asked for is so much beyond what any reasonable being would suppose could be expended for a public funeral, that the public will insist upon correct details being given to show how the money was gotten rid of. We all know that the circumstances attending the death of the late Premier were such, that public opinion, I think, fully supported the Government in giving his remains a public funeral. I do not think there is any complaint about that, but the sum total of the expenditure put down here is so outrageously beyond what any person's idea of the expenditure would be, that there should be full particulars given.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps we had better let the item stand until the Minister of Public Works is in the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would ask that copies of these accounts be laid on the Table, or that they be published in some way so that members can know what they are. We do not want to criticise this item unjustly, and I think there is a disposition to allow everything that is generous, but unjustifiable extravagance will not be endorsed by myself, at least, even if it is for a public purpose, the propriety of which I am not slow to acknowledge. I do not wish to say one word against the propriety of giving the remains a public funeral, but in this, as in other matters, there is a measure to the extravagance that should be tolerated, and painful though it may be, I will insist upon having this matter discussed.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Are these accounts to be placed in such a position that members can have access to them?

Mr. FORBES. Cannot copies be laid on the Table?

Mr. HAGGART. The original accounts are here, and there are objections made to a number of items by the officers of the department, I will try and get copies laid on the Table.

Item allowed to stand.

Contribution to the Lady Thompson fund \$25,000

Mr. LAURIER. This item had better be allowed to stand along with the other one.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no connection between the two votes.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman will see that it will save a great deal of time if the two items are taken one after another.

Item allowed to stand.

Collection of Revenue—Customs—

To pay Mr. Miles Cowan, clerk in Her Majesty's Customs at the Port of Windsor, Ont., an allowance in addition to his salary for services rendered while acting collector at that port, from 1st June, 1889, to 30th November, 1892. (Revote.)..... \$600

Mr. McMULLEN. What is this for?

Mr. WALLACE. This account was voted last year, but was not paid out. Mr. Cowan acted as collector of customs for about two and a half years, and this is as the vote states.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is his salary?

Mr. WALLACE. His salary was \$1,100 a year then, and it is now \$1,200.

Mr. MCGREGOR. This amount is all right. Mr. Cowan acted as collector for nearly three years, and as the collector in that district gets \$1,900 a year, the country saved a large amount by availing of Mr. Cowan's services. They have twenty-five officers under the collector there, and there are three railways, and the ferries cross every five minutes. This is a very active customs point, and the amount collected is very large, being in the neighbourhood of \$250,000 a year. Mr. Cowan is a very efficient officer, and instead of the amount being \$600, it should be a good deal larger, and should be \$1,200 at least. He is one of the best officers I know of in the department, and even now, after the death of the old collector, the new one having been appointed, this gentleman (Mr. Cowan) and Mr. Morton have to take full charge of the office at times, because the collector who has been appointed is not an efficient officer.

Legal expenses Toronto Railway Company vs. the Queen \$1,143 79

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There was a litigation between the company and the Crown to ascertain whether the electric car rails were free of duty or not, under the general item in the tariff, and the decision was that they were not free.

Mr. McMULLEN. Did it cost \$1,100 to ascertain that point?

Mr. FOSTER. We have to have a case made up and argued before the courts.

Mr. FRASER. Were the other parties not able to pay?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They will pay the costs taxable against them.

Mr. FRASER. Did the Government agree to pay their costs?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. FRASER. Then, why does not the Government claim the costs from the other side?