

until just now. It is something new in this House that a Star Chamber committee should consider a matter of this kind and recommend a certain course to the House, without giving any explanation for taking the course recommended. I protest against such a doctrine. I do not want to vote for anything or be considered as voting for anything that I do not understand. I question very much the wisdom or propriety of doing anything here that we are afraid should get out to the public. What will the public think we are doing when they read the speech of my hon. friend from Halifax? They will think that we are wasting public money for the purpose of finding a position for some individual in whom certain members are interested. That is not an impression which should be allowed to go abroad, and I do not think it will be tolerated by the House or the country. I propose, for one, that all the facts connected with this matter shall be made public. If the recommendation is right, we will endorse it, and if it is wrong let us reject it.

HON. MR. HOWLAN—As one of that committee, I wish to say to the hon. gentleman from St. John that the committee is not a Star Chamber at all. It is composed of a large number of members of this House and is the very opposite of a Star Chamber committee. I am satisfied if the hon. gentleman had been there and heard the discussion he would not have made the remarks he has just made. At the meeting of that committee we had the leader of the Opposition and a member of the Government present to see that nothing wrong was done. The matter was discussed fully, and the conclusion arrived at is the recommendation contained in the report which is now before us. Unless there is some good reason for rejecting the report it should be accepted by the House. I admit that every report of a committee is subject to discussion in the House, but at the same time the House should credit the committee with having discharged its duty. If they think that the committee has been influenced by improper considerations they should appoint another committee. This young man Davis has contributed to the superannuation fund, and the recommendation is merely to give him back his money. I cannot see how any public money is misappropriated in super-

annuating this man. I may say that more than three-fourths of the members of the committee approved of the recommendation in this report, and I think it would be better to adopt the report than to send it back for further consideration.

HON. MR. ALMON—When I first heard that an employé was to be superannuated I enquired how old he was, and I learned he was about 35 years old. I think, therefore, that superannuation does not apply in this case. I was told the young man had bodily infirmities which prevented him from discharging his duties. I asked if he had a certificate from a medical man stating what his bodily infirmities were, and I was informed by the chairman of the committee that he had not. Now, in Nova Scotia, and I fancy in other parts of Canada, there is no charge made against the Government of this Dominion which is more injurious to them than the charge that they superannuate people who are quite competent to discharge their duty in order that they may make room for favorites of the Government. Whether that is the case or not in the higher and more remunerative offices, we should be careful that no such charge can be laid against us. If this young man is to be pensioned for bodily infirmities there ought to be a medical certificate showing the cause; but I believe that is not the reason at all why he is unfit for his duties. However, I will not enter into particulars, as I will not make charges that I cannot substantiate, but if what I have heard is true, he ought to be reprimanded, and told that if he has to be superannuated again he will not get another chance, but will be discharged. If I could move an amendment to the report I should like to move that he be reprimanded and told that if it is necessary to deal with his case again he will be discharged.

HON. MR. McINNES (B.C.)—Since my name has been mentioned in connection with the proposed superannuation of Davis, I may say that as a member of the committee I took very strong grounds against the recommendation of the Housekeeper to have this man superannuated.

HON. MR. POWER—This illustrates the objection to which I refer, that a domestic arrangement of the Senate should be discussed, and these little details go on our