

was ever associated with Mr. Haycock in any seizures and paid for that service?

Mr. FIELDING. The officer of the department assures me that he has no information of that kind and I can certainly say from my knowledge that I have no information. It might not have come under my notice but the officer of the department, who should know, assures me it is not so.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I refer to a seizure in the city of Chatham, against the M. J. Wilson cordage company in which Smith accompanied Haycock on the settlement of the seizure. The fine was collected by the Magistrate, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Haycock together in a private office. I asked the amount of the seizure last year and it was stated to be \$300.02. Of this \$67 was given by a cheque to Mr. Haycock and Mr. Smith's bill was \$245. Mr. Smith refused to accept a cheque payable in Chatham for his share of the spoils, if they were spoils, he wanted the cash and when he could not get that he wanted a cheque payable at Toronto. The cheque was paid.

Mr. FIELDING. Whose cheque?

Mr. CLEMENTS. It was drawn by the M. J. Wilson Cordage Company. I have the cheque and can produce it if the minister cares to see it.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend says he has the cheque I take it for granted that he has. If Mr. Smith were employed in a legal capacity it would be by the Department of Justice and any payment to him would come through that department. If my hon. friend will intimate what information he desires I will feel it my duty to inquire and at a later stage to answer any question he chooses to put.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I would like to have the whole transaction gone into.

Mr. FIELDING. At what date did this occur?

Mr. CLEMENTS. In 1904-5. It is supposed that Mr. Smith came to Chatham in his official capacity as a government agent. The cheque was made out separately to Mr. Smith and he wanted to get his share. It does not appear in the Auditor General's Report except the fine, \$300 and the \$67 to Mr. Haycock.

Mr. BENNETT. As I understand it, this comes out of the Department of Trade and Commerce and such a case should surely come within the knowledge of the deputy. It seems extraordinary that Mr. Smith, ex-Liberal organizer, should go up there with Mr. Haycock, also an ex-political organizer and take these people by the throat and that Mr. Smith should take \$245 out of them. Such a case must surely be in the knowledge of the department. These men are well known, their characters and repu-

tations are known all through the country. My hon. friend just described this man Haycock in accordance with his known reputation. Last night the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) described certain men as thieves and embezzlers in the public service. It is no use mincing matters, let us call a spade a spade. We have the case of Wagner, a convicted thief who is in the Department of the Interior. This man Jackson at Hull was stigmatized by Judge Street as a perjurer. It is about time that the public should know the true character of these men. It is a disgrace to Canada to have a man of the character and reputation of this fellow Jackson in England to-day. If the minister met a British cabinet minister in England to-day and was asked who Jackson was, I venture to say he would sacrifice the truth rather than tell his reputation, he would be ashamed to say that Canada had to-day as their agent in England, a man of the reputation of this man Jackson. Look at the department of Public Works. The second most important official in that department stands before the whole country, a convicted thief, as can be seen in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At what page does the hon. gentleman find that?

Mr. BENNETT. I shall give it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the hon. gentleman should give it now.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman wants to drag out the name of one of his officials I will give it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do, and if my hon. friend will pardon me, I think I have a right, when a statement of that kind is made in the Commons, as head of the department and in justice to the officials of the department to insist that the reference to the Auditor General's Report should be given so that it may be known to what official the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. BENNETT. I will give it when I sit down, but in the meantime I will make this statement of facts that last year after the Auditor General had challenged a large expenditure by an important clerk in his department—I will give his name privately unless the minister wants it publicly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do.

Mr. BENNETT. It is Mr. Gelinas, secretary of the department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is not second in the department.

Mr. BENNETT. Secretary and the second official in his department, next to the deputy minister. When the Auditor General pointed out a large amount charged for hack hire what was the result? He refunded the money, practically admitted that he had been embezzling. Where is he now? Is he