

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is also quite incorrect, and I think he will find some difficulty in establishing the fact that I have laid down any such doctrine or principle as that which he lays to my charge. There are certain portions of his statement that are quite correct; there are other portions which are not correct. If the hon. gentleman refers to the remarks to which he has alluded, he will find that I challenged any one to show that in the administration of the Customs Department any man had been dismissed for political reasons or for interfering in elections. That is my recollection of what I said. If I were understood to say anything more, I was misunderstood. I take the responsibility of my own acts, and I spoke for myself only. Does the hon. gentleman think the remarks he made were fair and courteous to the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood). Is it to be laid down as a principle that when a member of the Opposition rises in this House and prefers charges against the Government, and drags into the discussion acts done in other counties which affect materially the representatives of those counties, those members are to be denied the right of rising and defending themselves without having it said: "We are glad there is somebody here to speak on behalf of the Government." Now, that may be the Liberal doctrine, and I have no doubt it is: that no man has a right to defend himself, or to say anything unless it is in accord with their sentiments. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) was strictly in accord with his right as a member of this House in contradicting the statement made by the member for Prince, (Mr. Perry). The charges as made, in addition to those brought against the Government, affected his own constituency and were equally strong against the Government for something that the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Perry) said had been done in the County of Westmoreland. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) repudiated that, and I do not think he has stepped without the bounds of propriety, nor did he interfere in any way with the functions of any member of the Government, in defending himself and that county in this respect. I have no sympathy myself with the doctrine laid down by the member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) to the extent to which he carries it, and I hope the time is far distant when any Government will adopt the principle in this country that he has advocated to-day. I have very little to complain of in the statements of the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Perry) providing they are accurate, but I have no knowledge of their accuracy, and I venture the assertion that when an investigation is had upon this question, it will not be found that anyone in connection with the Prince Edward Island Railway ever asked a man to swear how he cast his vote before that man could obtain employment.

Mr. MULOCK. If the statements are correct what will you do?

Mr. BOWELL. When the statements are laid before me, and if I am in that department, I will act as I usually do in matters of all kinds—properly and correctly, and I feel sure my action will meet with the approval of my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock). The hon. gentleman has told us that some person—I did not catch the name, and I might say that it would be much

easier to have the investigation made, if the hon. gentleman will supply the name of the person who wrote the letter to which he referred.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I did.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not speaking about you, I am speaking of the member for Prince (Mr. Perry). I hope you do not deny him the right to make charges, even if you do deny the right of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) to defend himself. The statement was made that some person—if he gave the name I did not catch it—had paid \$100 for the use of a train to convey voters, and that it was stated in that letter that the \$100 would be refunded—I presume after the election—and the hon. gentleman said that he had no doubt that the \$100 had been refunded. The hon. gentleman then complains that the Minister of Railways does not give him an answer at the present moment to the charges. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that the head of the Railway Department, or of any other department, can by any possibility keep within his memory all that he desires investigated; the payments made for tickets, or the employment of trains in different parts of the country? If he does think this, I am inclined to believe that if ever he attains to the position of a Minister, he will find that he would have more to carry in his head, large as it is, than it is capable of holding. I have made enquiries of the chief engineer, who came into the Chamber behind the Speaker's chair a few minutes ago, if he had any knowledge of this transaction, and he assures me that he has not and that he knows nothing about it. However, as the matter has been brought before Parliament, and as a charge has been made, it will be my duty to instruct the chief engineer to make enquiries into the charge. I know that the member for Prince (Mr. Perry) is fertile, not only in his denunciations of the Government, but also in the charges which he prefers against them on all questions; but the hon. gentleman did not tell me who the tidewater, preventive officer, or Customs official, I forget which, that was dismissed because he voted for him. I inform the hon. gentleman that no such dismissal ever took place, and if any officer was dismissed it was because, as I read in a report to the House two or three years ago, a number of officials on Prince Edward Island who had no work to do were dismissed. All the dismissals were made upon the responsibility of the inspector who made a thorough investigation into the working of the Customs Department all over Prince Edward Island.

Mr. PERRY. They immediately appointed another officer in this man's place.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know to whom you refer, but if the hon. gentleman gives me the name, instead of making broad charges, then I will be able to tell him how correct he is in the statement he makes. As I told the hon. gentleman before, I cannot be expected to remember what has transpired in reference to the cases of individual officials among the thousands throughout this whole Dominion. I repeat the statement I made a few moments ago, namely, that if any one in his locality, or upon the Island, was dismissed, it was not on account of the vote which he gave, but for good and sufficient cause. I have no objection to