

ways indicated to the officials of the department that they regard them as very satisfactory and very useful.

Mr. PUGSLEY. While the matter is fresh in my mind, I desire to say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) who sits opposite me, stated that in the Auditor General's Report for 1906 I would find correspondence in reference to the secretary of my department which would indicate, if I remember the hon. gentleman's words correctly, that he was shown to be a thief.

Mr. BENNETT. I used the word embezzler.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have read the correspondence and I say to my hon. friend that there is not one word there to sustain his statement. No matter what mistakes, no matter what errors Mr. Gelinis may have been guilty of, there is not one word in that correspondence which would justify the hon. gentleman making such a charge as that. I say it is unworthy of any member of this House to make a statement of that kind against a young man who is not here to defend himself.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) is getting very brave; he was not so very brave the other day; his bravery has dropped up suddenly. In the first place I did not wish to mention the name of his clerk and I told him so at the outset, but he has precipitated the name of his clerk into the discussion and I can tell the hon. minister that it is not the fault of the clerk, but the fault of the system of this government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh.

Mr. BENNETT. It is the fault of the system which has permitted this thing to go on and condoned it. The hon. gentleman will find that the Auditor General draws attention to the fact that this gentleman has charged several hundred dollars for cab hire, and when he is called upon to give an explanation he said that he had a book that contained day by day the items of his expenditure. But when this clerk is taken in hand by his minister and when the whole matter is laid bare he refunded two or three hundred dollars. Does the minister challenge that statement? Now, this brave minister, he sits there like what? I will let the public judge what it thinks of him. The minister has right under his hand a statement which shows that \$300 were returned by the secretary. Why did he return the money? If he had expended it honestly in the public service why did he give it back? And when he is questioned he gave the childish answer that he did not keep an account of this \$600 or \$700 expenditure, but that from time to time he put it down on a lot of small pieces of paper and that not thinking he would ever be called upon to produce these pieces of papers he destroyed them. I

ask the minister to tell me why the secretary returned that money. If he honestly spent it, why did he go down in his pockets to give it back? I am surprised that this minister who was so judicious the other day, who was so careful the other day, who was so thoughtful to keep out of the storm, should have rushed in to-night. It is true there is a reward offered for the discovery of the hon. gentleman; the hon. gentleman has gone from one end of the country to the other challenging any man in this House to make a statement about a certain expenditure in a New Brunswick election, and when the hon. gentleman is challenged to make the statement he sits there as dumb as the oldest Egyptian mummy that was ever embalmed. You cannot drag a word out of him. Yesterday he was slapped in the face in his own caucus for making charges outside and not being able to substantiate them, and one of the greatest newspapers in the country has a cartoon showing a barn and there is a man making a great noise inside that frightens the animals, and protruding from beneath the barn there is a pair of massive feet and there is a prize of \$5,000—

An hon. MEMBER. \$500,000.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. minister deals in large sums and the newspaper offers \$500,000 for any person who can find the man to whom the feet belong. Well, it is the hon. gentleman who is under the barn and he will stay under the barn. Now, the hon. gentleman came up here with a reputation for a certain amount of brag, bluff and bluster. He has sustained it outside, but he has not kept it up in this House. I would recommend the hon. gentleman, when I again make a statement in this House, not wishing to drag in the name of one of his clerks, to have a little respect for the clerk's feelings and not make it public himself. I tell the minister again that it is plain from that report that the secretary of his department returned to the funds of Canada \$200 or \$300, and I ask him, if that money was honestly disbursed, why did he return it? Canada is not so poor that it is going to take from a poor clerk \$200 or \$300 of his own money. The minister had better be careful in future when he makes statements in this House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I feel that I ought to be very grateful to the hon. gentleman for the gratuitous advice he gives me. I am new to this House, I am a stranger to a large number of the members, but I trust that I shall be able so to conduct myself as to gain the respect of this parliament. Since I came here I have heard statements made by some hon. gentlemen which I would not have expected to hear in a parliament of gentlemen, and I think the hon. gentleman ought to cultivate the habit of discussing public questions in a manner that will not reflect discredit on the parliament of which