

ent grades of office. The highest grade is that of a Deputy Minister, and the next is that of chief clerk. The latter commences with a minimum salary of \$1,800, and the maximum is \$2,400. This gentleman was made a chief clerk, I presume. Is that correct?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. He was.

Mr. WALLACE. This officer was given the maximum salary of a chief clerk the first day he stepped into his office. I do not think there is an example of a similar proceeding in any department of the Government since the new Administration came into office, and I am quite sure there was not such a case under the late Government. He got the most-favoured treatment. An hon. member has read the list of salaries of accountants of the different departments. The other Ministers have recognized that when a new accountant came in he was doing pretty well if he was promoted to the position of chief clerk and commenced with the minimum salary of that position. But this gentleman was a relative of the Minister. He tells us he was a brother of the member of Parliament for Halifax; but I do not think the member for Halifax appointed him or recommended him. It is not usual for members on this side of the House to be called upon to make recommendations; it was not the practice under the old Government, and is not under the new Government. The outrageous proceeding, in my opinion, consisted in this, that this officer is a relative of the Minister and was given treatment not accorded to any other gentleman, that when he was taken into the service because he was a relative, and from the start he received the maximum salary of a chief clerk. The Minister made some insinuations about Mr. O'Meara, and said he could tell something if he only wanted to do so. I contend, however, that now is the time and here is the place to give the committee information, and it is entitled to receive all information. If Mr. O'Meara has been incompetent, we are entitled to know it. We have the evidence of his chief for many years, the late Minister of Militia, who testifies from his experience that in the greatest emergency which has tested the capacity of the department, in 1885, Mr. O'Meara proved a most capable and efficient officer. That was the opinion I had formed from a general knowledge of Mr. O'Meara's capacity, capability and honour. If there is anything to be said derogatory to him, we should know it. He received a superannuation allowance of \$1,680 a year. He received \$2,400 for performing the duties of his position, and the performance of those duties now costs the country \$4,080; \$2,400 to this gentleman with the fortunate name of Borden, and \$1,680 to Mr. O'Meara, whose days of usefulness have not passed

away. But he was superannuated, I understand from the Minister, because he was getting old; or was it because he was inefficient?

Mr. QUINN. It was because he could not change his name.

Mr. WALLACE. No Irish need apply. I do not think, however, it was for that reason; but we are entitled to know whether it was on account of his age or his inability to adapt himself to the new system of book-keeping which the Minister was inaugurating.

Mr. BERGERON. For the sake of economy.

Mr. WALLACE. I think we are certainly entitled to a full statement of what the Minister has insinuated he could say with respect to this matter, something that will satisfy the committee, for we want to be satisfied. We desire that the Minister shall tell us what he has not told us yet and furnish some justification for the superannuation of Mr. O'Meara at \$1,680 a year and the appointment of the Minister's relative at \$2,400 a year, without examination, without complying with the Civil Service Act, in defiance of the law of the land and in defiance of fair-play to other officials in the public service. In this connection I might fairly ask the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who is making his bow across the House and who apparently is ashamed of this conduct, for he usually sits behind the Minister of Militia, and he has now got as far away from him as he possibly could without coming over on this side of the House; I would like to ask the Minister—no the hon. member for North Wellington—

Mr. FOSTER. He should have been a Minister.

Mr. WALLACE. If the hon. member for North Wellington were Minister of Militia and Defence—

Mr. BERGERON. Borden would not have been there.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Borden would not have been there with \$2,400 a year to commence with, in defiance of all law, and Mr. O'Meara would not have been superannuated at \$1,600 a year when he was in good health and capable of efficiently discharging his duty. I once had a little faith in the hon. member for North Wellington; more than I have lately. This world is full of surprises and indeed I would not be surprised to hear that hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) get up and say that this was the finest transaction that he ever knew of in his life.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WALLACE. Oh, yes. I would not be surprised to hear him say that everything in connection with it is most economic.