

that Mr. Petit denies the accuracy of the letter which has been published, may I ask him by whom is it denied—by Mr. Petit himself?

Hon. Sir OLIVER MOWAT—I have not the denial from himself personally; some one else has stated that he denies it.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Oh!

Hon. Sir OLIVER MOWAT—I am aware that he denies the accuracy of the statement, but he is to be written to officially, and then his communication will be public property.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—And if it is ascertained that he is the author of the letter, I presume the hon. gentleman will take steps to bring him to justice, in the same way that the late Minister of Justice did in the case of the Connollys and the case of McGreevy.

Hon. Sir OLIVER MOWAT—I don't want to anticipate or make any announcement before I know all the facts of the case; and then I will consider it.

## THE LATE SENATOR KAULBACH.

### INQUIRY.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—I should like to bring to the attention of the House a question which I think is of interest to us all. I see in the estimates a sum appropriated for the payment of the balance of indemnity to the late Senator Kaulbach, and that the same is made in favour of his wife or family. As that might give rise to doubt as to whom the balance of the indemnity should be paid to, I think it is but right to draw the attention of the leader of the House to the fact that it is in that position. If the cheque is made payable to the wife or family, it might be that the family would lay claim to a portion of the cheque, and I think undoubtedly, in a case of that kind, the indemnity is intended for the benefit of Mrs. Kaulbach. It should be understood that the cheque is for the benefit of the wife, and that the family has no claim to any portion of it.

Hon. Sir OLIVER MOWAT—I happen to know that the object of putting the item in the form in which it appears in the estimates, was to give the government an opportunity of ascertaining how the money should

go. We had not the information necessary to know how it should be paid, and in order that we may be able therefore to make the payment afterwards, we require knowledge of the subject, and the item was put in its present form.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—There was no will, and I hope after drawing the attention of the government to it, that every precaution will be taken to see that the cheque goes to Mrs. Kaulbach.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—So far as my recollection serves me, in all cases of a similar character, payment has been made to the wife, if not to the daughters or some one else most entitled to it. I am quite sure, on investigation, it will be shown that the widow of the late Senator Kaulbach is entitled to this money. There are many circumstances, which it is not necessary for me to allude to now, but which, I have no doubt, will be brought to the notice of the leader of the House, that will induce him to take that course and to give the cheque to the widow. I am glad the hon. gentleman has called attention to the subject.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I wish to express my entire concurrence in the views expressed by the leader of the opposition and the hon. member from Shell River.

Hon. Sir OLIVER MOWAT—I gather from what has been said by hon. gentlemen who are acquainted with the facts, that they are aware that this payment should be made to the wife. We have had similar questions to deal with in the province of Ontario, and we generally found there that the wife was the person who should equitably get the money; but occasionally there were circumstances making payment to the wife improper, and therefore in the present case we put the item in such a form that we might make the necessary inquiries.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY—As I come from the same province as Mr. Kaulbach did I entirely endorse what has been said by my colleague on the other side of the House, that the widow is properly entitled to the money voted.

The Senate then adjourned.