

proper salaries to pay for their services they were called upon to discharge. The salaries were fixed in that way and paid in that way. The Chief Engineer has stated correctly, in the letter which the hon. gentleman has read, that he had no power to fix Mr. Horetzky's salary; but, on the other hand, the Government had no power to pay except on the certificate of the Chief Engineer. Mr. Horetzky's salary was fixed in that way, and when his services were performed he was settled with, and he gave a receipt in full for the amount he had received. He subsequently made a claim on the department for a larger amount, on the ground, as the mover of the resolution has correctly stated, that he found that some other officer, who was an engineer, had been paid at a higher rate than that at which he had been paid. I, of course, referred Mr. Horetzky to the Chief Engineer, or to the gentleman who had been Chief Engineer at the time, and he gave Mr. Horetzky the letter which has just been read by the hon. member for Gloucester. The Chief Engineer very properly says that he had not power to fix the salary, but when he adds that he would refer the letter to the Minister for his favorable consideration he does not go far enough, because the Minister had not authority under the law to pay a single additional dollar on that letter. After Mr. Horetzky had been paid and had given a receipt in full for all the services he rendered, I said that it would be necessary for Mr. Fleming to state the additional amount, if any, to which he thought Mr. Horetzky was entitled on a review of the question, and that if Mr. Fleming would do so the Government would give his recommendation very favorable consideration. Mr. Fleming declined to certify to any larger amount, and, of course, it was not proper for the Government, under these circumstances, to pay any larger amount, Mr. Fleming considering that he had had a suitable salary assigned to him, which he had received in full for services rendered. I have no objection whatever to all the correspondence relating to the matter being brought down.

Mr. DAWSON. I do not know anything about Mr. Horetzky's accounts, but as his name has been mentioned I would take this opportunity of saying that, judging from his explorations, I consider him a very capable and energetic officer. He did what I consider a very plucky thing, something like the voyageurs of old time, when, in 1872, he went to the Peace River, and with very little assistance, with only two men with him, and in the commencement of winter, he crossed over the Rocky Mountains and made his way to the Pacific Ocean. It was a most extraordinary feat, one that we do not see performed every day. When he came home he wrote a most interesting work, containing the best information we had up to that time upon that country, and I would be very glad if the Government could see its way to remunerating him on a scale commensurate with his services.

Motion agreed to.

COST OF EXPLORATION IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. ANGLIN, in moving for returns showing the cost of each expedition employed in exploring the country in the neighborhood of the Peace River and the Skeena, and the northern routes, for a railroad to the Pacific Ocean, said: I think this motion will show that the services rendered by Mr. Horetzky in his explorations were very valuable, and that he economized carefully, doing almost as much work as Mr. Fleming, at a much less cost. Many hon. gentlemen have read the very interesting report by Mr. Gordon, and his account of the services rendered by that expedition. I have no doubt the gentlemen employed in that expedition did the best they could to carry out the instructions of the Government, that they ascertained as far as possible the character of the country through which they passed, and that it was not a mere pleasure excursion on their part. They seem to

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

have been delighted with the appearance presented by the flora of that country, and altogether it seems to have been, in the early part of it, one of the most delightful trips they could have undertaken. I think, in the other case, there was a good deal more labor and hard work, attended with much inconvenience and perhaps some suffering. At all events the reports will show that Mr. Horetzky conducted his share of the work in the most careful and economical manner, and was therefore all the more entitled to a fair remuneration.

Motion agreed to.

THE DISMISSAL OF D. J. MORSE.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) moved for copies of all correspondence in reference to the dismissal of D. J. Morse, from the position of Sub-Collector of Customs at Bear River, in the county of Annapolis, together with all reports of Inspectors of Customs, and others, and any other correspondence bearing upon the subject. He said: This motion refers to the dismissal of the Sub-Collector of Customs in the county of Annapolis. I do not believe there has been a dismissal in the western part of Nova Scotia for many years, that has attracted so much attention as this. Newspapers, on both sides of politics, have blamed the Government in connection with it. This Mr. Morse was appointed Sub-Collector of Customs at Bear River sometime in 1877. From the time of his appointment until his dismissal, the revenue at that port continued to increase. I make that statement because one of the charges against him is that he was negligent in the discharge of his duty. In July, 1878, Mr. J. J. Kerr, Inspector of Customs for Nova Scotia, was sent to Bear River to report upon eight charges made against that gentleman. The report of Mr. Kerr states that there was no foundation whatever for those charges. Shortly after this Mr. Morse submitted evidence to the department at Ottawa, charging the owners of a certain vessel in that locality with violation of the revenue laws, and upon the evidence he submitted, being the sworn affidavits of a number of the seamen of that vessel, he was instructed to seize the vessel and lay a fine upon it, and to demand payment from the owners for a certain amount of the cargo that had been smuggled by these seamen. Subsequently, after considerable correspondence with the department, indulged in by some members supporting the Government in the western part of Nova Scotia, the department advised the Sub-Collector to release the vessel and to make no further demand upon the owners for the fine. In December, 1879, a Mr. Wolff, a gentleman, I believe, in the employ of the Customs Department, was sent to Bear River to inquire again into certain charges preferred against Mr. Morse, and after he had examined the books and papers of the Collector, he expressed himself as perfectly satisfied with everything in connection with the management of the office. He expressed himself thus both to Mr. Morse and to other gentlemen in that section of the country. Mr. Wolff returned to Ottawa, and on the 21st of January, he addressed a private letter to Mr. Morse, written, one would say, from one friend to another, in which he made no reference to the fact that he had reported that the charges preferred against Mr. Morse were correct. On the 21st of March, nearly three months after Mr. Wolff's visit to Bear River, the Commissioner at Ottawa addressed a letter to the Collector of Customs at Digby, the superior officer of Mr. Morse, instructing him to remove the Sub-Collector at Bear River from his position. This was three months after Mr. Wolff made his report. This gentleman was dismissed without having any opportunity to reply to the charges made against him. After his dismissal, I am credibly informed, a certificate was forwarded to the department, signed by all but two of the merchants and importers of Bear River, stating that he was