

and that there is
of his. At the
is not true. I

Then, Mr.
the gem of the
leman has of-
though it is in
I presume to
of a dispute in
a man named
Nelson, who
named Lucile
ulars of this,
and then he

ing, and rested
ted that unless
ive proof of the
advise Mr. Faw-
to say, dismis-
of the plain-
for one week.
Lucile Elliott
; he had re-
ning and was
lock in Major
his private sec-
ment policemen,
ghtly visits to
nce of the trial,
decided in Lu-
the time of his
s the Commis-
wers to remove
s decisions and
ided, Donnelley
ould not appeal
ld see that he
a on Lower Do-

Major Walsh, as
verse the de-
Major Walsh
a unrighteous
man, and that
er relations—
with Major
h to exercise
witness seems
paraphrase, he
dge Maguire,
ifted, is, that
Walsh, and
udge Maguire
in favour of
re would not
n, if he had
ment. But he
ffer from
regard to the
think he is a
gh character.
to the mem-
ories, to say
e Maguire is
des, and as a
f the North-
now, and I
it is in ac-
ctice of this

Parliament that a statement of that kind about a Superior Court judge should be read in this House unless the man who reads it is prepared to back it up. What are the facts? To-morrow at three o'clock I will lay the papers in this case upon the Table of this House. The facts are these: There were two certificates issued by Mr. Fawcett for the same ground. Dominion Creek was staked from what they called Lower Discovery, and also from Upper Discovery. The parties came in and applied for certificates; one was granted upon a claim staked one way, and another granted on the same claim staked the other way. The result was that they overlapped. The ground between the two discoveries had been exhausted, they overlapped, and there were two certificates granted for this particular claim. A protest was entered, the matter came before Mr. Fawcett for decision. Mr. Fawcett said it was a complicated case, and he called in Judge Maguire. The case was tried before Judge Maguire in due form of law. He heard the evidence and heard counsel on both sides. Apparently there was no official ring, because Mr. Wade was on the opposite side from this woman, he was for Mr. Donnelley in this case, and he argued it as well as he could. Judge Maguire gave a long and exhaustive written judgment in favour of this woman and her partner. Mr. Fawcett decided the case upon Judge Maguire's judgment, and signed it as Gold Commissioner. They appealed the case. Mr. Donnelley, apparently was in a position to fight for his rights. The case was appealed to me at Ottawa. Mr. Samuel H. Blake was retained to argue the case for Donnelley, and to see that he was not defrauded of his rights. I saw it was an important case, it was the first appeal coming before me, and as there were precedents to be made, and rules to be laid down as to what kind of evidence should be admitted, I called in the Minister of Justice, Hon. David Mills, and the Secretary of State, Hon. Mr. Scott, two lawyers of long experience, both as public men and as administrators. We heard the case in open court in the Railway Committee room upstairs, and the Minister of Justice, the Secretary of State and myself unanimously decided that Judge Maguire's judgment was right. I will lay the papers in this case upon the Table of the House to-morrow, and any hon. gentleman can read them for himself, and decide for himself. I say that no member of this House can conceive of a more outrageous accusation, a more outrageous proceeding than to read any such insinuation as that. Why did not the hon. gentleman write a note to me to ask if there was any ground for supposing that Judge Maguire had given an unrighteous decision? Surely that would not be much trouble for an ex-Minister of Justice, a man who knows his responsibility to Parliament and what is due a judge. Surely, before making such a charge against a judge, it would have been wise for the hon. gentleman to send a clerk

to the department to look up the papers, to see what the record was, to know something about it, at least, before making such a statement in the House. But nothing of that kind was done, and he reads an anonymous statement from a man, which bears upon its face, in the mind of any lawyer accustomed to read and analyse statements of facts, the plainest evidence of utter carelessness and recklessness, because any one knowing anything about departmental business would know that the man making that statement could not have known anything about the truth of what he was alleging. Yet the member for Pictou makes that statement without the least analysis or inquiry, and places it before this House, to stand upon "Hansard" against Judge Maguire to the last day of his life. Who can say that the man who reads that statement upon "Hansard" ten years from now, will read my reply at the same time? When you put such an allegation as that upon the "Hansard" of the House of Commons attacking a man's character, you are doing a very serious thing. Then there is another thing.

We are charged with outrageously underpaying our officials, that we sent a lot of men up there and gave them starvation pay, and consequently we could not expect them to be honest. Well, Sir, here is the list, and here are the salaries. I think the salaries are good. Mr. Oglvie, the Commissioner, gets \$5,000. When he was employed by the late Government, he got \$1,800. W. H. P. Clement, legal adviser, gets \$2,500; Mr. Bliss, clerk of the Commissioner's staff, gets \$900, and his salary increases to \$1,200. Another clerk has \$900, another clerk \$1,200. Mr. Senkler, Gold Commissioner, gets \$4,000, the salary of a judge in the Court of Queen's Bench for Ontario. Then there are a number of clerks whose salaries run from \$900 to \$1,200. The registrar gets \$2,000; the abstract clerk gets \$1,200; the controller, Mr. Lithgow, gets \$1,500; I think he only got \$1,000 or \$1,100 formerly. Mr. Snell, a clerk in the controller's office, gets \$1,200. The head land agent gets \$1,800, another clerk in his office gets \$1,500; timber inspector, \$1,200; three clerks in Crown Timber office, \$900 each. The cook gets \$1,200, and the assistant cook, \$720. Now, be it known that the Government furnishes for these men both quarters and provisions. The most of these men were never as well off in their lives before, financially, as they are now. I do not find fault with that; I think they ought to be better off than they were before, because most of them are living away from their families, and endure considerable hardship and privation. We have made them a little better off than they were in the respective positions from which they came. There is no ground whatever for the suggestion that our officials are underpaid. Now I will prove that in this way. The officials there, the heads of the department, have hired a number of clerks in addition to the ones we sent up, and they are all getting about one-