

public interest that a Minister, under his responsibility, should desire the removal of an officer, he has a right to remove him, and may refuse to be accountable to Parliament for his act. Of course, he is accountable in this sense: Parliament may say we have no confidence in your judgment; but, being responsible for the management of his department, he may say it is for the public interest that the officer should be removed. The House of Commons in England always assents to such action of a Minister. But if the hon. gentleman would look back to the circumstances under which Mr. Bodwell was appointed, he must know that a Mr. Smith held office as deputy when Mr. Mackenzie was at the head of the department, that the late Premier removed him and refused to give any reason therefor, or examine into his conduct. He never got any satisfaction, and, as I am told, the whole of the people in that part of the country, without reference to political proclivities, petitioned for the restoration of Mr. Smith as a worthy deserving and efficient officer. As I understand it, certain complaints were made against Mr. Bodwell and sent to him for an answer. On the face of the paper the Minister of Railways thought that a case for enquiry was made out. An enquiry was held; Mr. Bodwell retained counsel, counsel being also retained by the Government in order to marshal the evidence and keep the examination within the limits of the charges. The papers will show the result, and hon. gentlemen will see from them that the Minister of Railways acted with every sort of kindness in transferring Mr. Bodwell to an office of accountability, affording him an opportunity of rising in the service. He now enjoys an advantage not possessed before, of being a civil servant. I may say this, that the salary he now draws is not equal to the salary he drew as Superintendent of the Welland Canal, though it is equal to the salary his successor draws now. The Government thought that the salary paid to the Superintendent of the Welland Canal was too large for the duties he performed, and it has been reduced. It is true my hon. friend may say it is more expensive to live in British Columbia than near the Welland Canal. That may be; but, on the other hand, Mr. Bodwell, by being employed as he is now, is a civil servant and will rise in the world, but he could not rise where he was. At all events, I can assure the hon. gentleman that the aggrieved person did not consider himself aggrieved, as he told me that he was very well treated.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT EXPENSES TO ENGLAND.

Mr. CAMERON (South Huron), in moving for a return showing the expenses in detail incurred by the several members of the Government and any other person or persons in the service of the Government, or paid by the Government, sent to England or elsewhere on behalf of the Government, or in the service of the Government, from the 10th February, 1880, said: I would like to enquire why it was that the returns for this same subject were not brought down last year. On the 15th of February last a motion in the same words as this motion precisely, was passed by the House, and, as far as I have been able to learn, the returns then called for have not been brought down to this day. I find also that, on the 23rd of February of last Session, a motion worded in the same way precisely, but covering a different period, was also adopted by this House, and, so far as I have been able to learn, the returns have not yet been brought down, although ten months have since elapsed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can tell my hon. friend that the returns asked for last year, as well as those asked for now, shall be sent down at once.

Motion agreed to.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS.

Mr. KEELER moved for detailed statements as follows: 1. All judgments rendered by the Supreme and Exchequer Courts, since the 1st day of January last. 2. The amount of claim in each suit. 3. The amount of costs in each suit. 4. The amount of fees paid to the Registrar in each suit.

Motion agreed to.

EXPORT OF CATTLE TO ENGLAND.

Mr. DOMVILLE, in moving for a return giving a comparative statement of cattle and sheep exported from Canada to England, during the years 1879 and 1880; the return to be made up by months, showing from what ports in the Dominion they were shipped, said: My view is that these returns will show that we have not yet done much in the lower provinces in the way of exporting sheep and cattle. I shall endeavor to prove by these returns that we require proper communication, and I shall endeavor to bestir the Government to turn their attention to the port of St. John, and lend us some aid in order to re-establish direct steam communication with Europe.

Motion agreed to.

POST OFFICE AT PARKHILL.

Mr. COUGHLIN moved for copies of evidence taken before the Post Office Inspector, in the course of the present year, with reference to the affairs of the Post Office at Parkhill.

Motion agreed to.

NEWSPAPER POSTAGE.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for a return showing postage paid in each month of the year ending June 30th, 1880, by daily newspapers of Ontario and Quebec, including in each case their weekly edition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would like the hon. gentleman to explain why he makes this motion. It is not a matter in which the House or the country can have any interest in the world. It has always been refused in England, as well as by the Post Office Department in the Dominion. It is a matter of the private business of the newspaper. What interest, can anyone have to know whether the Woodstock Review or the Brantford Courier has the greatest circulation? It is an interference with private business. I am quite sure it would not be granted in the United States, and I do not think it ought to be granted here.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Prime Minister is quite incorrect in saying that this information has been refused in the United States. It has always been granted in the United States. I do not see any impropriety in making public a matter which is of public interest, as this certainly is. In dispute between parties as to their circulation, it may be a matter of interest to the public to know which is right. It is a method which is adopted in the United States, and it supplies information to which, I think, the public are entitled.

Mr. MILLS. I suppose a court of justice could compel a publisher to give the information as a basis for the rates which he may be charging for advertisements, so that the hon. gentleman would be only giving information which could be obtained by a court. Merchants or traders who advertise in newspapers, have a right to know whether the representations which are made to them by publishers are true. I think the information sought for would be to the public interest.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And if a merchant should advertise that he has the largest, best and cheapest stock in the world, we could bring him up in court, I suppose, and