

tirely a mistake. If vouchers are required for these disbursements and no vouchers were forthcoming, the items should not have been included in the expense account; I think the minister will agree with that. It seems that he has laid down what I regard as a very salutary rule, that not only must the vouchers be produced, but the Deputy Minister must add his signature, so that there may be no mistakes of this kind. That is very good for the future. So far as the past is concerned, the minister is inclined to take a gentle view of the question, but I think the gentleman in question should not have included these items unless he were prepared to furnish the vouchers, and it is unfortunate, to say the least, that the mistake made in his expense account was entirely in his own favour and against the interests of the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I quite agree that it was unfortunate for the young man that the mistake occurred, but in the face of his positive assurance that the money was actually paid out I would be very sorry indeed to make the statement which the hon. member made in regard to him. As I said before, I think it is wholly unwarranted in the correspondence in the Auditor General's Report. The rule which has been established will prevent such a thing occurring again.

Mr. BOYCE. I presume the minister has no reason to doubt his statement that the money was paid out?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no reason.

Mr. BOYCE. Then can he give any reasonable explanation of why the money was refunded by the young man after he had paid it out?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Surely the hon. gentleman can very well see that if the minister was not satisfied with the statement, as he had not the vouchers, the minister might say: I cannot allow that, you have not the vouchers although you say you spent the money.

Mr. BERGERON. It was paid.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, he paid it back. The minister may have insisted that it should be paid back. I do not know what took place but I can understand that the minister might have said: You have not the vouchers for this, you say you paid it, you are positive you paid it but as you have not the vouchers the amount cannot be allowed and you should refund it. That is the charitable view of it and I am disposed to take that view rather than suppose that the young man committed the crime charged against him.

Mr. LALOR. The discovery that these vouchers were not with the accounts was made by the hon. member for North To-

ronto (Mr. Foster) and there is no credit for it due to the Department of Public Works.

Mr. FOWLER. Was all the money for which there were no vouchers refunded?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware as to that.

Mr. BENNETT. I shall refresh the memory of the House; the correspondence is in a preceding report of the Auditor General. The attention of the Public Works Department was called by the Auditor General to the fact that Mr. Gelinas had a bill of about \$700 of which a large part was for hack hire. Furthermore, in that letter the Auditor General calls attention to this fact that as this clerk lived almost on the line of the street railway in the city it was absurd to believe that he should have disbursed this large amount for cab hire. Mr. Foster brought this up in the House and read this letter and what was the result? Mr. Hyman then acting Minister of Public Works, must have brought Mr. Gelinas on the carpet, because it was announced afterwards that reparation had been made by Mr. Gelinas. The minister says the correspondence shows that it was a straight above board transaction. It was a mistake. Let me read this letter. It is dated from the Auditor General's office, April 3rd, 1906:

Sir,—A deposit receipt has come to hand for \$281.60, credited to 'casual revenue, 1905-6,' and endorsed with the following explanation: 'Repayment by F. Gélinas of portion of expenditure of 1904-5 (departmental contingencies), telephones, telegrams and letters under travelling expenses, \$128.85; cab-hire at Ottawa, \$152.75, total \$281.60. Please send a detailed account, showing the manner in which these sums were calculated.

The letter from this office dated April 22, 1905—

That is the year before.

—discussed the charges of 1903-4, as well as those of 1904-5. What progress has been made towards adjusting any over charges of 1903-4, and previous years?

Your attention is called to the second-last paragraph of Mr. Gélinas' letter of April 27, 1905 (transmitted to this office February 16, 1906), which reads as follows: 'I do now make the most categorical declaration that all the sums charged in my accounts were duly spent.'

At what date did the necessity for a refund become obvious to you? Was it after February 16, 1906, the date of your letter or transmission?

I am, sir, your obedient servant,  
J. FRASER,  
Auditor General.

Where is the answer to that letter? There is no answer forthcoming. Here is Mr. Gelinas in 1905 making a categorical denial that there was one cent improperly charged by him, and here is Mr. Gelinas in the year following giving back to the de-