

he is a member. With regard to myself, let me say that when it becomes necessary for me to defend myself I am prepared to do it either here or before any other tribunal or in any other place; but I will not permit any member of this House to tell me when I shall speak or what course I shall take in this parliament or anywhere else. As to that, I shall exercise my own judgment. But, Sir, to-night the hon. gentleman made what I thought was a most unworthy, most unjust and most unwarranted attack on a young man who is employed in my department. That young man is not here to defend himself. He charged him with being an embezzler. He mentioned the secretary of my department, and then he hides himself behind the excuse that I asked him to give the name.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman will pardon me. I told him across the floor of the House, and 'Hansard' will prove it, that I would give him the name privately, and he refused that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is worse still for the hon. gentleman to make a statement that will go broadcast throughout this country that there are men in my department who are guilty of embezzlement and who are being kept there. This parliament has a right, and the public have a right, to know who is the man to whom the hon. gentleman refers. If it can be shown to me that there is any man in my department who is guilty of theft or embezzlement, he will not remain there one hour after the proof comes to me; but I shall not take the word of the hon. gentleman as proof, because the hon. gentleman's reputation has gone beyond the bounds of this parliament as one who is not always sure of his evidence when he makes statements with regard to the character of others. I repeat that a perusal of the Auditor General's Report, while it shows that this young man has made a mistake in not keeping an accurate account of travelling expenses, cab hire and other bills, does not show that the amounts charged were not expended by him. It does not show that he is guilty of the very serious crime which the hon. gentleman has charged against him.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman does not yet read the correspondence, which shows that the clerk does not give an explanation why the \$200 or \$300 was refunded.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have read the correspondence.

Mr. BENNETT. The name of the clerk would not have been heard in this discussion if the hon. gentleman had not precipitated its mention himself. The hon. gentleman has paid his respects to myself, saying that he has heard my name outside. I can only say that I cannot reciprocate and say that his name has been heard par-

Mr. PUGSLEY.

ticularly in Ontario. I think the hon. gentleman's name would have been very little known in Canada, at least in Ontario, had it not been for that braggart defiance which he threw out a few weeks ago. That was the hon. gentleman's entry into Ontario politics, when he made certain charges against the honoured leader of the opposition. That is what advertised him. Perhaps that is what he was seeking for—cheap notoriety. He has got cheap notoriety by that, but he has got cheaper notoriety by his silence in this chamber.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the nature of the mistake?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I find in the Auditor General's Report that Mr. Gelinus declares that every dollar of his bill had been expended in travelling expenses, not only for himself, but for certain other persons, including some messengers connected with one of the departments; but as he had not the vouchers, he apparently consented to make a return at the request of the minister. He still, however, makes the positive statement that these moneys were disbursed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it the practice to require vouchers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. I may say that the rule of the department now, which I have given instructions strictly to be adhered to, is that the accounts for all these travelling expenses shall be given item by item, and shall be certified to by the Deputy Minister.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was that the old practice?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Apparently not; there was some looseness. The secretary, being I admit somewhat careless, had not kept an accurate account in writing of the various items of expenses.

Mr. BERGERON. There was a rule some twelve years ago that money would not be paid unless vouchers were given.

Mr. FOWLER. Might it not be possible that this young man had mixed his own private cab hire with the public?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He says not, positively.

Mr. FOWLER. It is possible for that kind of thing to occur. I do not know that I have in mind any instance under this government; but I know that in our local government there was some private business mixed up with public. These things might occur.

Mr. BENNETT. Was it a minister?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It might perhaps be no more than right to remark that it is unfortunate that the mistake was in favour of the young man himself. It is a charitable view, perhaps, to say that it was en-