

in the old Provinces of the same rank. In some few cases, officers were appointed at higher salaries owing to being sent there and to the increased cost of living; therefore, these percentages is not given to those officers, but only to those who get the same salaries that are given here.

Mr. BLAKE. A proposal was made some time ago regarding allowances, and some officers in Manitoba, I think, got what were said to be board allowances at a certain rate instead of a percentage. I should suppose it important to have a uniform system, and whichever was preferable should be adopted.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We ask for \$3,000 to meet those cases, but these allowances are asked for other Departments to cover what may be termed board allowances, although all are based on this same principle.

Mr. BLAKE. This is the general principle?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It applies to all the Departments out there.

Mr. BOWELL. It was established by the Treasury Board.

Mr. BLAKE. I would like an explanation regarding the Durnford and Bellemare items.

Mr. COSTIGAN. This is one of the old claims which I hope will not create a good deal of discussion, when I inform the House as to its nature.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is only fifteen years old.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am sorry that it has remained so long unsettled. These claims have been investigated, and I am quite satisfied that no payment has ever been made of the one-half year's salary to these officers. This was due to the change of Departments just after Confederation. These claims have since been pressed, and before recommending payment to the House, we made enquiries, and our officers have reported that these salaries were never paid to these two men, and that it was only fair that payment should be made.

Mr. BLAKE. This is a most extraordinary statement. The hon. gentleman says it is on account of Confederation

Mr. COSTIGAN. I said it was on account of the changes following Confederation; that is the only way in which I can account for six months' salary remaining unpaid.

Mr. BLAKE. Confederation took place a whole year before this began.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In 1867.

Mr. BLAKE. On the 1st July, 1867; and this half-year is from the 1st of July to the 30th of November, 1868, and these gentlemen were in office before July, 1868.

Mr. COSTIGAN. They were in office before Confederation.

Mr. BLAKE. They were paid monthly before that time?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No; but by the year.

Mr. BLAKE. Were their salaries not payable monthly?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I find from the 1st of July to the 30th of November, which does not indicate half a year, and I presume they were paid monthly.

Mr. BLAKE. How is it? When were these claims made? Surely their salaries were not cut off without some notice, or without some complaint being made at the time. Did they complain in 1868, '69, '70, '71, '72 or '73? How is it that it was not attended to then? This seems most extraordinary, most incomprehensible. Was there any report from any officer? Is there any evidence to be brought before the House to justify this vote?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I understand something about this vote with reference to Mr. Durnford, as the papers
Mr. COSTIGAN.

were placed in my hands some time ago, before the Minister took possession of his office. Mr. Durnford, as I understand it, was an officer who, subsequent to this period, became stamp distributor, or stamp officer, for the Province of Quebec. Up to the 15th of November, or between July and November, he also acted as Inland Revenue officer, and then these offices became separate. During this period he collected some very large amounts, over \$100,000 of revenue for the Dominion, and at the same time he was acting as stamp distributor for the Province of Quebec. He received no remuneration, and he made a claim for it at the time, but did not persistently press it on this Government, further than to put it in and to write about it several times, because he was of a nervous disposition, and was frightened lest it should interfere with the other office that he held. He died some two or three years ago, and his widow has pressed the claim ever since. The officers of the Department, I am informed by Mr. Miall, made a very close investigation into it, and are satisfied that he never received the salary for that period, and that the statement is perfectly true. He collected for the Dominion a very large amount of revenue, and only received the small salary which he had for performing his provincial duties. That is the story. I got the letters which Mrs. Durnford sent; I asked Mr. Miall about it, and this is the information which he gave me.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, if the claim was made at the time, it must have been considered at the time. It cannot be presumed that the Government threw the claim of a public servant on one side, into the waste-paper basket. It must have been considered and disallowed.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It was not disallowed.

Mr. BLAKE. It was not accepted, at any rate.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I saw the papers; but there was no disallowance or consideration.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman was not then in Parliament.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I saw the papers.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman does not know how diligently the Administration of that day performed the duties of their offices. I decline, for the credit of that Administration opposite with which I sat all that time, to assume if possible that they wholly neglected a claim of this kind, and having considered it, they must have decided that it was not fit to be paid. I have some remote recollection, gathered as the hon. gentleman spoke—and thought that the question was familiar—of a question of this kind once being raised, the officer having been a Quebec officer; and I think that something was indicated to this officer, that he must choose which service he would take, and he accepted the Quebec instead of the Dominion service.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I think so.

Mr. BLAKE. I think that something of that kind occurred. Now, the question is, whether this gentleman's main office was not the Quebec office, on what principle is this salary fixed? Was the salary assigned to the office later? or did it belong to the office before they were separated? How does it happen that this discrepancy or difficulty arose in July, 1868? If I rightly recollect the first Government of Canada gave notice to these people that they could not serve the Local Government and them too, and they elected to serve the Local Government. I think, Sir, that we should have the papers before us before being called on to vote this sum of money. I have stated more than once, and I repeat again, that claims fifteen years old, particularly for salaries and allowances, are generally all wrong and without foundation; people press them at the time and they are not granted because they have no foundation. When we are to'd fifteen years afterwards that