

could not be held as official or protected by law, there was an action for slander brought against Mr. Dewe. The Government undertook the defence of Mr. Dewe, and I did not at all complain of that, although Mr. Dewe was not acting officially in making that statement. The case was fought out and carried from Court to Court, the Government standing between Mr. Dewe and protecting him in this action. Although Mr. Waterbury satisfied the Court and the jury that he was innocent, he got a verdict of \$6,500—he remained for years under the suspicion of having committed a grave offence. Afterwards his innocence was established beyond a doubt by other circumstances arising quite independent of the evidence at the trial. For about six years this case was dragging, and during the whole of that time this young gentleman was under the imputation of being a felon, and it was thought allowing him \$750 a year would not be too much compensation under the exceptional circumstances of the case. I suppose in defending himself he spent fully that amount. It is an exceptional case, and I hope we will not see a similar vote appearing in the Estimates for another year.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Would it not be better, instead of putting it down as compensation for loss of office, to put it down to pay expenses incurred by Mr. Dewe?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That would be better.

Mr. BLAKE. There is a little difficulty in reconciling the statement of the hon. gentleman with what I understand to be the law. He says it was because Mr. Dewe, in an unofficial manner, made a verbal statement of the circumstances of the dismissal, and the action was brought. Yet, if I rightly understand the case, the legal defence, upon which the verdict turned out to be inadmissible, was that the communication was a privileged one, that Mr. Dewe had communicated only to such persons as he was warranted in doing in the discharge of his duty. If Mr. Dewe did make such a communication as that, and the case was brought under those circumstances, Government ought not to have taken up his defence, and the Government could not have succeeded in saving him from the consequences of such an act. The hon. gentleman has said that the officer must be dismissed without cause being assigned, and so it is unless Government chooses to assign the reason. If a man be dismissed for immoral conduct I would not have any objection to let him know the reason if he asked it. If that is all that occurred, if there was no more said by Mr. Dewe, what has this young man suffered more than any man who after being charged with an offence, afterwards proved himself to be innocent. By the wording of this vote the House is laying down the principle that if a man is wrongfully removed from office he is entitled to compensation.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH. This is a dangerous principle to establish. I am not opposed to this vote, but it should be manifest to all future Parliaments that we did not commit ourselves to this principle. What right has this young man to compensation any more than a person who is indicted and acquitted. The young man instituted proceedings against the Government and was acquitted as being innocent of the charge. This is no doubt an exceptional case. I will not vote against the appropriation. The language should be changed so as to show Parliament has the right to remove officers. The difficulty was that Mr. Waterbury asked for an investigation and Mr. Dewe refused it, and he then had recourse to the Courts.

Mr. ANGLIN. It was after the dismissal of Mr. Waterbury that the statement appeared that he was dismissed, because he was suspected of having rifled letters. He suspected Mr. Dewe as being the author of the statement, which he denied, and Mr. Waterbury complained of the manner in which he was treated. It was because of some-

thing said by Mr. Dewe that the action was brought. Mr. Dewe had Mr. Waterbury brought into the presence of the postmaster and the clerk, and in his presence charged him with being guilty of the offence, and stated what led him to that conclusion. Much sympathy was felt for Waterbury in St. John, especially after it became known that the offence was committed by some other person in the establishment. I am satisfied the grant would meet with approval in St. John, at the same time there is room for serious doubt as to the policy of establishing such a precedent as is now proposed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It might be changed to read "to reimburse Mr. Waterbury his costs in the case of Waterbury vs. Dewe."

Mr. MACKENZIE. A case has come up in the English Parliament this year, where an innocent man was convicted of attempt to murder. The Home Secretary agreed to ask a vote to compensate him for the injury done by the unjust sentence.

Mr. ANGLIN. I trust that the hon. Minister will see that the money is paid into Mr. Waterbury's hands and no one else.

Resolution, as amended, agreed to.

197. Surveys of Dominion Lands..... \$450,000

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The increase in this vote is in consequence of the necessity of keeping pace with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Last year about 9,000,000 acres were surveyed into lots for settlers, costing \$350,000. The projected surveys for this year embrace 10,000,000 acres along the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and 8,000 square miles of outlying townships in preparation for sub-division surveys next year. In addition to these, there are to be three outlying surveys—one at Edmonton, one at Battleford, and one at Prince Albert. Complete surveys are to be made at these points with the view of meeting probable settlement.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I understand that this work will be completed at an average cost of 4 cents an acre. Will this vote of \$450,000 enable him to survey the full belt of twenty-four miles on each side of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in addition to those side lines?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I fancy so.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman expect to survey the whole of the remaining lands to the Rocky Mountains this season?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We are going to try and keep pace with the construction of the railway. The Company hope to get the road built by the end of next season as far as Calgary, near the Rocky Mountains, and we are going to try to keep pace with them.

Mr. MILLS. I understand that at present the whole country is surveyed as far as those surveys have made progress. It will be a waste of money to survey inferior lands on which people will not settle. I think it would be well to block out the country in outline surveys, unless the land over any large area is utterly unfit for settlement. But we should be in no hurry pressing the sub-division townships, except at points to which immigration is being directed. A very large portion of the land so surveyed will not of course be occupied for many years; settlers will pick out the best lots, and the others will be neglected.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I have it stated that sufficient means have not been taken to render the surveys practically useful in years to come; that the wooden stakes and other marks made cannot be expected to be permanent, and that surveys will have to be made over again, if means be not taken to mark more permanently and distinctly the outline surveys.