

cer at a salary of \$1,100 a year. Last year I asked for a similar amount, stating to the House at the time that I did not propose any change in the salaries of officers in the department because I did not feel qualified to pass judgment on the amounts paid to the different officers. When it became my duty to examine the matter very closely, I formed the opinion, from information obtained from the head of the branch and from examining Mr. O'Hanly's work, as far as I was capable of doing so, that Mr. O'Hanly was paid altogether disproportionately to the value of the work he performed. I do not think that in strict and severe justice I have sufficiently reduced the amount, but there were considerations which prompted me to act on the side of mercy, and allow the salary to be \$800. I therefore propose a reduction of \$300. I do it on the ground that this amount represents the worth of Mr. O'Hanly's services. I do not want to say more, and I ask the House to accept that as my statement, and as also as being the statement of the head of the branch to which he belongs. I think in July, 1896, the Minister confirmed Mr. O'Hanly in his appointment and salary of \$1,100. I would be willing to do so if I thought his work justified it. I am compelled to say, however, that it does not, and I frankly state that I cannot recommend Parliament to pay a larger sum than the amount named.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think I should say something as to this appointment, as it was made on my recommendation. A vacancy occurred in the department. Several applications were sent in, amongst the applicants being Mr. O'Hanly. We made inquiries as to his qualifications in relation to the technical branch of the service. We found that he was as well qualified as any man in the technical service of the country; that he had been a practical engineer, had been employed in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway for many years, and had been employed temporarily in the Department of Interior, and was there at the time I proposed to transfer him and give him this permanent position. His appointment was under consideration for a couple of weeks before the transfer took place, because the chief officers of the branch of the Interior Department where Mr. O'Hanly was then working, were urging very strongly that, on account of his industry, his application to work, and the intelligence with which he discharged his duties, they ought not to lose the services of so valuable an officer as he was, and that he should be made permanent there. It was because that could not be carried out, that they reluctantly consented to the transfer to my department, on the very highest recommendation that any officer could leave one branch of the service to go to another with. Mr. O'Hanly was appointed at \$1,100 on the

understanding that it would be made \$1,200, and I think the salary of \$1,200 was voted for him. Whatever deficiencies may have been charged against Mr. O'Hanly—I cannot say as to what reports have been made—I know that he is an engineer, that he has given practical test of his ability in that profession, and I know that his superior officers in the branch that he left, and while I was there in the branch that he came to; never gave two opinions as to his industry and to his attention to the duties imposed upon him. He was then considered a most satisfactory officer in every way. I never learned until just now, that there was the slightest question about his ability in the discharge of his duties. The hon. Minister (Mr. Davies) has stated that politics had nothing to do with these changes. Well, politics had nothing to do with the appointment of Mr. O'Hanly, because if politics had anything to do with it, he would not have had the appointment. The politics of Mr. O'Hanly's father are pretty well known in this country, and if there is a prominent Liberal in his section, it is Mr. O'Hanly, senior. Therefore, the appointment was not made out of consideration of his politics, and I thought that perhaps Mr. O'Hanly might have received as generous treatment from the gentlemen now at the head of the department as he received from me.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am sorry my hon. friend (Mr. Costigan) should intimate any want of generosity on my part. I am aware that Mr. O'Hanly's father is a Liberal, and he himself is supposed to be a Liberal, and I was disposed to give him fair even-handed justice. His industry I do not call in question. He is a technical officer, however, and I am bound to accept the reports of his superiors in office. After examining his work and the time he takes to do his work, I have been able to form an honest and fair conclusion, and in fact, I think I have gone possibly a little further than I should have gone in recommending that a larger salary than \$800 should be paid to him. I may say that I have been pressed from a great many quarters on this point, and there were many considerations which might prompt me to err on the side of what my hon. friend (Mr. Costigan) is pleased to term, generosity; but I cannot see that in the discharge of my duty as a public servant, I would be entitled to allow mere feelings of generosity to weigh with me. There must be justice done. While I regret it—nobody regrets it more than I do—at the same time, I cannot recede from the conclusion I have reached after a good deal of consideration, pressed as I have been from all sides, and knowing him to be a Liberal and all that.

Mr. McINERNEY. Is this the only reduction in the department?