

of the vessel gave \$10,000 or some other very large sum—perhaps less than \$10,000, or may be more than \$10,000—to Mr. F. C. Wade as a retainer to him to engineer things through for him, and this was one of the things he engineered.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is not there.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is sworn to by Mr. Wade.

Mr. WALLACE. It was read out to-night.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Not that Mr. Wade had anything to do with the entry.

Mr. WALLACE. I am saying that Mr. Wade's client had to do with the company, and Mr. Wade got a retainer of \$10,000, or less or more, and he had to earn the money, or the man who gave him the retainer would be dissatisfied at the end of the year, and would want to give him a less amount.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. How could he earn the money?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. By defrauding the revenue.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. How could he do that without the inspector being a party to it?

Mr. WALLACE. The minister gets behind the inspector and stays behind. He says that if the inspector thought there was a fraud, he should have suspended the collector. I ask the gentleman who is placed over the inspector, and who is responsible directly to us, to state what he thought about this matter?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I thought that Mr. McMichael had done what he thought was right. I have confidence in him; but I see that the hon. gentleman has not, and the gentlemen about him have not. He talks about my getting behind the inspector. I will not do that, for if I were led to believe that he defrauded the revenue, he would have to go; I would not be behind him or anybody else.

Mr. WALLACE. Evidently the minister cannot answer a question without misrepresenting. I have not said a word to-night to imply that the inspector of customs was guilty of any fraud. On the contrary, I have said that he is an officer who I believe does his duty honestly, conscientiously, intelligently and well.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Why should not I be guided by his report, then?

Mr. MONTAGUE. His report shows that there was a fraud.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It does not. If there had been fraud, it would have been his duty to have seized the vessel.

Mr. WALLACE.

Mr. WALLACE. I must insist on the minister paying a little more attention to the rules of order. He has to justify his own course, and it will not do for him to say: I have an officer there, and will get behind him, because he is a capable and honest man. The minister has a duty to perform as well as the inspector. The inspector says: My opinion is that the article, which was valued at \$10,000, should have been valued at \$25,000 at the very least. What does the hon. minister think of that? He will not tell us. Does he think that the man who made that entry should have got clear with the penalties inflicted under clause No. 8? There are other clauses which inflict higher penalty.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The department did not inflict the penalty. It was Mr. McMichael who inflicted it himself.

Mr. WALLACE. That is where the hon. minister makes his mistake. The minister inflicts the penalty.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You are wrong.

Mr. WALLACE. The report is made to the minister by the inspector, and has to be signed and approved by the minister.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman is wrong. Mr. McMichael went there with full power to deal with the case. If he considered it a case of deliberate fraud, his duty was to have seized the vessel; but from the fact that he did not seize it, but inflicted the penalties provided by section 8, he evidently did not consider it a case of fraud. Mr. McMichael imposed this penalty himself, without the consultation of the department, and the fine was paid before he left Dawson at all.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. minister has told us that half a dozen times already, and instead of adding to our information, is simply giving further proof of his cowardice in having no opinion of his own. He says that he sent the inspector out there with full powers. He cannot clothe the inspector with any powers which parliament does not confer on him, nor can he take away any power that parliament confers. The minister cannot escape his responsibility in that way. He knows that this money was paid under protest, and that everything came before him. The question is whether Mr. Wade, who was found closely connected with other frauds against the country, and his clients were to be punished, or whether the influence of Mr. Wade was so strong with the Minister of Customs, as it had been previously with the Minister of the Interior, and the Minister of Marine, that these parties escaped with a punishment altogether incommensurate with their offence.

The House divided on the amendment (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper).