

HON. MR. POIRIER—Then they did not succeed in carrying their point. A New Brunswick man should have been appointed, beginning, of course, at the foot, because I believe in promotion. I have no objection to the gentleman who received the appointment. I do not know him, but I have no doubt he is equal to the position. I am sorry to see that in this House, of late years, appointments have been made in a vicious circle and that due regard has not been paid to the claims of the different Provinces; but other influences have been allowed to prevail. I do not intend this as a protest, but I am sorry that the old rule and precedents were not followed in this instance, and that a gentleman from New Brunswick was not allowed to come in at the foot of the ladder to replace that efficient deceased servant, Mr. Miller.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—My hon. friend from Acadia brings a charge against myself, as a member from New Brunswick, and a little later justifies the course that I took. There was an application for the position from New Brunswick by a gentleman who, for a time, faithfully filled an office on the staff of the House of Commons, and who would have been very glad to have taken the position made vacant by the lamented death of Mr. Miller, who had been appointed in recognition of the claims of New Brunswick at the time of the Confederation. I attempted to set forth at the meeting of the committee that the vacancy really belonged, according to the old order of things, to the Province of New Brunswick, provided a proper application was received. A proper applicant did present his claims—Mr. Richardson, of Richibucto. These claims were ignored by the almost unanimous voice of the committee, on the ground very properly taken by the hon. member from Acadia—that is, the ground of promotion. The position formerly occupied by Mr. Miller was filled up in this way and other officials promoted, and hence there was no place left for the applicant from New Brunswick, because when a real vacancy came to be filled the salary being only \$600 the applicant could not accept it.

HON. MR. POIRIER—I would ask the hon. gentleman if the applicant would not accept the position at that salary.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I had no instruction to press the application at that salary. I had a letter from him fixing a minimum amount, and consequently I felt myself entirely justified in not pressing his application any further. I took the only course I could on the committee under the circumstances, while I think the claims of New Brunswick have not been fairly considered in all respects. With reference to the matter before the House, although I took no particular part upon the committee on the question of superannuation as it is termed—and wrongfully termed in my judgment—I felt it was an exceedingly difficult and delicate case. Had there been a division on the committee I should certainly have voted against superannuating a young man 35 years of age without any proofs before us that he was suffering from any infirmity which would justify such a course. I do not think we have any clear proof of inefficiency or misconduct; but certainly if it was either, we would be laying down a very bad precedent if we superannuated for such a cause.

HON. MR. DEVER—With reference to this matter, I feel that there has been more than one injustice done. This case I must consider as a shuffle of the cards in favor of certain parties.

The Senate divided on the amendment to refer back paragraphs 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 of the report, which was adopted: Contents, 18; non-contents, 12.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Tuesday, March 4th, 1890.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (23) "An Act to incorporate the Belding, Paul & Company, Limited." (Mr. Vidal.)

Bill (M) "An Act to authorize the Toronto Savings Bank Charitable Trust to invest certain funds." (Mr. Sullivan.)