

founded or not, but I will see that the statement is brought down.

Motion agreed to.

#### THE CASE OF MR. E. V. BODWELL.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex) moved for copies of the correspondence and other papers on which was based the Commission issued in the case of Mr. E. V. Bodwell, then Superintendent of the Welland Canal; of the Commission and all instructions in connection therewith; of all correspondence and papers touching the appointment of Counsel on the Commission; of the report and evidence; of all correspondence thereon; of all Orders in Council on, or other disposition by the Government of the matter; with a statement in detail of all the expenses connected therewith, including the amount paid to Mr. Bodwell or his Counsel; also, for all papers in connection with Mr. Bodwell's transfer to British Columbia, and a statement of the salary and allowances attached to each appointment, and any allowance made for travelling or other incidental expenses. He said: It seems that Mr. E. V. Bodwell, the late Superintendent of the Welland Canal, shortly after the elections in September, 1873, was removed from that position, and transferred, at very great inconvenience to himself, to a position on the Pacific Railway in British Columbia. The House has not yet been informed of the charges preferred against Mr. Bodwell, or the nature of those charges. It was generally supposed by the public that he was an excellent officer. He received testimonials at different times from those immediately affected by his services. Those who used the Welland Canal and came in contact with Mr. Bodwell, reported him to be a very efficient and painstaking officer. For some reason, which is unknown, charges were preferred against Mr. Bodwell, which resulted in his exculpation—because, although he was dismissed or considered unworthy of occupying the position of Superintendent of the Welland Canal, he was not considered unworthy of another position under the Government. The facts connected with the charges investigated, and the determination of the Commission, so far as this House is concerned, are still unknown. I am anxious to get at the facts, and also to get a bill of the expenses. I do not know whether the prosecution was a vexatious one or not—whether Mr. Bodwell was unfairly treated or not. If he was a good superintendent of the Welland Canal, I fail to understand why he should be removed; if he was an unworthy officer, I fail to see why he should hold any position under the Government. I wish to get at the facts to learn whether he was treated as a public officer should be treated, or, whether at the back of this investigation, there was some improper interference, and, therefore, I submit this motion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am a little surprised at the motion of the hon. gentleman. I have no reluctance whatever to bring down all the papers to which this motion refers; but I call the attention of the House to the very extraordinary circumstance that this motion, or a very similar one, was put on the paper a year ago. Mr. Bodwell was then in the lobby of the House on public business, he was here for the purpose of acquainting himself with the duties of the office to which he was transferred in British Columbia; and that motion, placed on the paper by one of his political friends, was removed from the paper. I have no doubt, at Mr. Bodwell's own request. I have reason to believe that Mr. Bodwell was very far from making any complaint with reference to my action as head of the department. I have reason to know that he was disposed not to make any complaint at all, but rather to consider that the Government and myself, as the head of the department in which he was employed, were anxious to do all we could to

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

promote his interests. The hon. gentleman cannot understand why, if these charges were sustained against Mr. Bodwell, he was not dismissed from his office, and why, if he was not competent to perform the duties of Superintendent of the Welland Canal, he could be competent to perform the duties of an accountant in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway in British Columbia. I may state very frankly to the hon. gentleman, that when the report of the Commission and the evidence are brought down, it will be made quite apparent to him why Mr. Bodwell should not be thought able, with advantage to the country, to discharge duties involving the expenditure of a great amount of public money. He might not be able to discharge those duties with advantage to the country, and yet, being a gentleman in whose integrity the Government had no reason to feel any want of confidence, he should be quite equal to perform the duties of the very important and responsible position which he holds in British Columbia. I found, from the report of the Commissioner and the evidence, that it was not in the public interest to retain Mr. Bodwell in the position he occupied, and turned my attention to the means by which as good a position could be found for Mr. Bodwell, and one in which he could satisfactorily discharge the duties incumbent on him. I acted, as the head of the department, with the sincere desire to do justice to Mr. Bodwell, and, at the same time, efficiently provide for the performance of duties which, according to the report of the Commissioner, he was not equal to performing. If the hon. gentleman insists, I will present the papers, but I think it only right to make this explanation frankly to the House.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope my hon. friend will press for the papers. Of course, it is quite possible that while the charges which were made against Mr. Bodwell may have turned out wholly unfounded, still the Minister may have come to the conclusion, as he now declares to the House he did, that Mr. Bodwell was not a suitable person to continue in the duties of Superintendent of the Welland Canal. It is quite consistent with the fact that no impropriety, such as was charged against him, was established, that that result may have impressed itself upon the mind of the hon. Minister, but I will learn with surprise, from all I have heard of Mr. Bodwell's administration of the canal in my time, that such is the result of the investigation. I am sorry that the hon. Minister did not wait until the papers came down, and, with the papers before us, make the statement which is calculated to be so damaging to Mr. Bodwell's reputation for ability and capacity as that which he has made. The case, I hope, in that particular, will remain in suspense in the minds of the House and the public until the materials, which the hon. gentleman says will prove his proposition, are placed before the House. I was not in Parliament when these proceedings took place, but I observed an account of them in the public press, and it had been my intention, during the last Session of Parliament, to have moved for these papers on public grounds and for the reason which I am about to explain. I did not move in the matter last Session because I found my hon. friend (Mr. Ross) had a notice on the paper. That notice was not prosecuted, and when it was dropped it was too late for me to put a notice on the paper. Then, as now, I had no communication whatever with Mr. Bodwell on the subject. I abstained from speaking with him, though he was an old personal political friend of mine, when he was down here. I abstained from inviting any discussion whatever of his position or removal, or anything connected with his case. I have abstained from corresponding with him since that time, because I was determined, if no other hon. member did, to move for those papers, and I wished to be able to say, as I do now say, that my action which is now confined to this statement was not prompted by any