

they were salaried. Mr. Mitchell read from the Superannuation Act in support of his view of the case, contending in particular, that under the 9th section Mr. Harley was clearly entitled to come in; also from the regulations made subsequently in elucidation of that law. The 9th section specially referred to persons employed "in the outside service of the said departments," and "to service in an established capacity in any of the public departments of the Government or offices of the Legislatures of any of the Provinces." In the regulations established for guidance in all cases under the law, the agents of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, as well as inspectors of lighthouses, were specially mentioned. The Treasury Board, he regretted to say, did not come to altogether the same conclusion he had—they doubted whether such an officer should be ranked as having had twenty years' service; of the four years since 1867 of course there was no doubt whatever. They agreed, finally, to give him ten years' service, and he was accordingly placed on the superannuation list at the small pittance of some \$216 a year. Yet he (Mr. Mitchell) had been accused before the country of having placed a man on the Superannuation Fund when he had no claim to such consideration. If a man in the position of Mr. Hanley had no right to receive a retiring allowance, then there was no use whatever in the Superannuation Act. As respects his successor, it was true he was a relative of his own, but he was known to be a man of respectability and influence, and was able to teach that gentleman who had so unwarrantedly made the accusation in question. He would not descend to the scurrility which had accompanied the charge, but he would say that the house with which that gentleman was connected had had the supplying of the light houses for 20 years and received just such prices as they wished; and it was therefore not difficult to understand why he felt aggrieved that the means of continuing the same state of things were no longer available for him. Before sitting down, he (Mr. M.) asked permission to refer to another matter which was also to be brought up elsewhere, and in connection with which the hon. member for Grandville (Mr. Letellier) had placed a notice on the table that day. If those charges were true, then he was unfit to occupy his present position.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST deprecated any explanations at that time, as not in the interest of the hon. gentle-

man, it was advisable to defer them until the motion came up in due form.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL would not go into the question, after the hon. gentleman had so kindly expressed a wish to defer the discussion. He would simply say that there was not a shadow of truth in the charges made against him. He could satisfy the House and country that those charges are baseless and malicious; and if the hon. member elsewhere dared to assert them again he would be ready to meet them.

#### TRANSLATIONS.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU offered a few explanations in reference to the mode in which the translators of the House performed their duty, on account of an allusion having been made on the previous day to some delay in the translation of the bill concerning public lands. The fault did not lie with them, the alterations made from time to time in the bill had delayed the translation. The translators performed their duties most satisfactorily in the opinion of the French members. The work had never been more efficiently performed than it was at present.

The House then adjourned.

FRIDAY, May 3rd, 1872.

The SPEAKER took the chair at three o'clock.

#### PETITIONS.

Hon. Mr. SANBORN, from the Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills, reported favorably on the following petitions:

Of Hon. John Young, Managing Director in Canada, of the Canadian and European Telegraph Company.

Of the Mutual Life Association of Canada.

Of Rev. William Morley Punshon, M. A., President of the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Church.

Of Sir Hugh Allan, and others, of the city of Montreal.

Of the St. Francis and Megantic International Railway Company.

Of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada; and of the Corporation of the town of Galt.

Of D. McInnes and others.

And of the Corporation of the village of Waterloo.

The Committee reported that the following petitions properly came under consideration of local legislatures:

Of the Board of Trade of the town of St. Catharines.