

into consideration the statements made by Belcourt & McDougal. Now, in view of this, I venture to think that the administration of the law, both with regard to the valuation and to the national character of this vessel has not been prompt or vigilant in Dawson, and that the government, and particularly these two departments are deserving of censure in that respect.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word or two as to the valuation. I think I can quite understand Mr. Davis's position. Here was a man who knew nothing of ships, a man who had been accustomed to the west where they have no ships, where there is not a man who knows anything about ships, and I can understand that it is very difficult to come at the real value of a ship of that age. Of course, experts can do it, but a man like Mr. Davis, accustomed to the west, I would venture to make the statement would not know as to \$15,000 of a difference between the real and the appraised value of a ship. There is a good deal in a man's view of it. I have seen, for example, a reputable citizen, a clergyman, go into court and swear that a property was worth \$11,000. He believed it thoroughly, and he got witnesses there to support him, and Justice Burbidge found an award against him for \$500, that being the value of the property.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Not against him surely.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). No, but in his favour. He found that the value of this property that had been placed at \$11,000 was really \$500. Such discrepancies occur, and I will venture to say that a vessel like this coming up to Dawson and coming before a man who knew very little about shipping, it is quite easily understood how he would come to the conclusion that after all \$10,000 was its value. Do not think that Dawson is a port like Liverpool in Great Britain, or Halifax, or St. John, where everybody knows about shipping. I do not know what the ship is worth, but I will venture to say that Mr. Davis honestly thought the vessel was worth no more. Mr. McMichael found that she was worth \$25,000. There is a man who knows all about it. But, will anybody contend that Mr. Davis, who is a reputable citizen, actually, for the difference, between the duty collected on a valuation of \$25,000 and of \$10,000 committed a fraud? If you do you are going to vote that Mr. Davis is dishonest, that he is fraudulent and incapable of holding that position. I do not believe that. I believe that if a man is going to do wrong, he is going to do wrong on a larger scale than that. When Mr. Davis was in this House he was held up to us as a certain Conservative amongst Conservatives who was an honest, outspoken and manly fellow who would not cheat for anything.

An hon. MEMBER. It was the company he got into.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I know that when he was here no member of parliament had a better reputation for stern every day rough honesty than had Mr. Davis. People up in Dawson say that he has not changed. Mr. McMichael went up there, and I ask particular attention to these words:

You are authorized to suspend any customs officer from duty in the Yukon district and frontier when, in your judgment, the public interests so requires.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have not only to come to the conclusion that Mr. Davis committed a fraud, but they have to come to the conclusion, that not only did Mr. McMichael commit a fraud, but, worse than all, that after he discovered a fraud he did not act. Therefore, he must also come in, but he must come before the other man because he is far worse. Mr. Davis, according to the statement of hon. gentlemen opposite, only committed one fraud, but Mr. McMichael, according to their statement committed two frauds. Mr. McMichael has been in the Department of Customs for years. Is it reasonable, or will it appeal to the common sense of this country to believe that Mr. McMichael went up there, that he made an investigation, that he discovered that there had been an erroneous entry of this vessel, that she ought to have been entered at a higher figure and that he would say that no wrong had been committed if there had been wrong doing? We must conclude that he did not find any wrong-doing because the absence of fault-finding shows that everything was all right. Was it to be expected that he would say, for example: I find no fault. Everything is presumed to be right till the wrong-doing is discovered, and his report shows that there is nothing wrong. I do not know but we had better deal with these two men. Not the only legacy are the officers left us by the late government, and they are the men that we should move swiftly at this rate. If their character is so much assailed by hon. gentlemen opposite the government had better perhaps move in the matter because hon. gentlemen opposite appear to have discovered that they are bad men. They have discovered that Mr. Davis, their own chosen friend and brother, wilfully and deliberately commits frauds. If he commits fraud it is only for the purpose of making money. There must be some consideration. Nobody would enter a ship at \$10,000 when she ought to have been entered for \$25,000, and do it for nothing. He must have pocketed the money. There is no other conclusion to be arrived at, and Mr. McMichael must have received something for closing his mouth; men do not act fraudulently for nothing: they get something for it. Is that the position that hon.