

it I will give a detailed statement of the expenditure on Concurrence. I have a list here, giving the different headings of the articles for the exhibition, such as pickled fish, smoked fish, frozen fish, fish in alcohol, shell fish, specialties, &c., the food upon which the fish live.

Mr. BLAKE. I think, however, when we are asked to vote a sum which will be in the aggregate the hon. gentleman tells us \$40,000, it would be reasonable to know in general terms what proportion of the vote is going in salaries, what is the plan adopted for collection, how much has been paid for the various articles, &c. There is a way of spending a sum of \$40,000 in which you can pay a great deal of money to the individuals for services and very little for the articles.

Mr. BOWELL. I will endeavor to get that information for the hon. gentleman, but I may say that I happen to know that the amount spent in salaries and otherwise for these collections is as moderate a sum as it was possible to cover the work, and I think when the particulars have been read to the House the hon. gentleman will find that there has been no extravagance whatever. I may say that in conversation with the Minister of Marine I know that he has been as economical as possible consistent with making the exhibition one which would be creditable to the country.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not charging the hon. gentleman or the hon. Minister of the Department with extravagance, but I think he would hardly expect the heads of the Department to say to him. "Now, Bowell, I am really very extravagant in all these expenditures."

Mr. BOWELL. On the contrary, the fear was expressed that he would not spend as much money as was necessary to make an exhibition which would be creditable to the Department and to the country.

Mr. DAVIES. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will let us know what is the proportionate amount spent in the different Provinces in connection with this work.

Mr. BOWELL. Do you want to see if you got your share?

Mr. DAVIES. No, I do not ask the question from any such low ground, and I hope the hon. Minister will give us some information on this point.

Mr. BOWELL. I will endeavor to do so.

296. Miscellaneous—To provide for a retiring allowance to following members of the Dominion Police Force: Superintendent O'Neill, Sergeant-Major Connor, and Constables Kane, Purcell and Jones; and a gratuity to Mrs. Egan, widow of constable Egan..... \$2,656.95

Mr. BLAKE. Were these men incapable of further service?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The practice of the Department is to allow the rate of one month's pay for every year's service. Mr. O'Neill was about sixty years of age, and had served ten years and 27 days. He was afflicted with asthma which incapacitated him for the discharge of his duties. Mr. Connor suffered from rheumatism, particularly while he was on duty in the police rooms of the Eastern block. He had been on service twelve years and six months. Mr. Kane was sixty-three years of age, and there were otherwise sufficient grounds for retirement. Mr. Purcell was short-sighted and could not read or write. Mr. Jones could neither read nor write, was fifty years of age, and for other reasons it was held that his retirement was necessary.

Mr. BLAKE. When was Purcell and Jones appointed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In 1874 and 1873, respectively. Constable Egan was reported to be in ill health, and before the Order in Council was passed he died, so that it is proposed to pay the gratuity to his widow.

Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. BLAKE. Each allowance is calculated on the basis of one month's pay for each year's service?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

297. Miscellaneous—To pay the legal expenses incurred in the defence of Mr. John Burgess, steamboat inspector for the district of Montreal, who was tried for manslaughter in connection with the explosion of the boiler of the steamer *Richelieu*..... \$743.50

Mr. BLAKE. What is the meaning of this vote?

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Burgess was indicted by the Grand Jury for manslaughter in connection with the explosion of the boiler of the *Richelieu*. He was placed on trial and acquitted, and the Government assumed the costs of the defence which have been taxed by the Minister of Justice.

Mr. BLAKE. On what principle did the Government assume the cost of the defence?

Mr. BOWELL. Because it was thought that he was improperly prosecuted, as the explosion was not his fault, and the Government believed that he, having performed his duty, should not be put to the expense of defending himself. As has often been the case, he was prosecuted for having ostensibly neglected his duty, and it turned out that he had not neglected his duty, and the Government did not deem it advisable that he should be put to the expense of his own defence.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the statement that the Government assumed the cost of the defence is a very unfortunate statement. When a Grand Jury brings in a true bill against a man for a criminal offence, I do not think the Government have a right to form a judgment for themselves as to whether the officer performed his duty or not. That is to be decided in the ordinary courts, and the Government should not be on one side prosecuting and on the other side defending. If after the trial, a case is made, it is possible, though I do not see why, for the Government to say that they will reimburse the officer for the costs of his defence. I am afraid, as a result of this, that the defence of public officers will be conducted at a very large cost. If it is found that the Dominion Government are at their back, the expenses will be charged in a much more lavish manner than if their defence is at their own expense. When I had charge of the Department, several of these cases came up and I do not remember any case on which I recommended that the Government should assume the costs of the defence of any officer. We are all exposed to the risks of indictments in the course of our business, and it appears to me that the Government are setting a dangerous precedent in assuming the defence in this case.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Can the hon. gentleman tell us who was the counsel retained in that defence?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know. Perhaps I did not make myself well understood; but the position of the Government is precisely that which has been indicated by the hon. leader of the Opposition. The memorandum placed in my hands states that he was placed on his trial and acquitted, and that the Government then assumed the expense, which was properly taxed by the officer.

Mr. BLAKE. Then are we to understand that in every case in which a Government officer is charged with a criminal offence, and is acquitted, the Government assume the cost of his defence?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the principle is well known, both in this country and in England, that each case is to be judged according to its merits. It rests upon each Department to protect its deserving officers, in the performance of their duty when they get into any difficulty. This should be done with great care and caution, and not without a thorough examination of the case; but if the Government want to have efficient officers, they must stand by them. I