

So has committed a wrong or that this other gentleman has committed some high wrong or that the ex-Minister of the Interior is guilty of malfeasance in office, but I would like my hon. friends here to understand that it proves nothing. The meanest subject of the land can be hired for a consideration to slander the name of any man in this country. It is always the unchaste who question the purity of the chaste. You go down to the slums or bar rooms of any city, or to the places where ignorant and unfortunate humanity live, and you find that it is their usual and every day practice to slander those people who are very much better than themselves. Now, I submit this, and I think surely it is a fair proposition, that a mere charge, a mere slanderous attack upon the honour and integrity of any man by another proves nothing, and I say that the obligation rest upon any member of this parliament, when he charges an ex-minister of the Crown with malfeasance in office, to at least invoke the machinery of this parliament in order to give himself an opportunity of making good his charge. But my hon. friend often makes these attacks upon the hon. member for Brandon, the ex-Minister of the Interior. Something has changed the spirit of the hon. member for North Toronto since 1896. I am told that he did smile occasionally before that time, but it seems that since 1896 he is much like the old English King whom some poet describes as never having been seen to smile again after the occurrence of a very sad event. The defeat of the Conservative party in 1896 was not so sad an occurrence as the one recorded in English history. But, my hon. friend from North Toronto does seem out of sorts. He is sullen and morose. He is like the Dane who says :

The world is out of joint : O, cursed spite,
 ' That ever I was born to set it right !

No good can come out of Israel according to the hon. member for North Toronto ; no good legislation can proceed from any administration of which my hon. friend is not a member. But, notwithstanding this I think it is a fact that this country has made progress even under the administration of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and I want to say concerning my hon. friend the ex-Minister of the Interior that I think it is due to him to say that although he was in public life but a short time—that is in this parliament—few men who have been in this parliament have contributed so much to the success and the welfare of this country. A great deal of the development that has taken place in the west is traceable to the aggressive and wise policy which he inaugurated in the department which was under his control. In the west there are many concrete evidences of the wisdom of legislation and administrative acts the credit for which, I claim, is due to the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior. Now, I think that the ex-Minister

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN.

of the Interior can very well afford to have placed his record of performances against the negative, colourless and unproductive record of the hon. member for North Toronto when he was Minister of Finance, and I think that the fair minded and intelligent citizens of this country will accord to the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior that fair measure of credit which is due to him and that the same discerning and discriminating public will resent the nature and character of the attacks made upon him by the hon. member for North Toronto last Friday night. My hon. friend also made an attack upon Mr. Smart, the former deputy minister of the Interior. The gist of his statement concerning Mr. Smart was that while in the department as deputy minister, he had deliberately and with malice aforethought, entered into, conceived and carried out a contract with a company or organization for the purpose of providing a place for himself when he left the Department of the Interior. The hon. gentleman said :

When Mr. Smart pledged himself to secrecy with regard to a company that never existed, with regard to the men who formed that syndicate, the identity of which he cannot show he admits another thing, that in 1901 he commenced private correspondence with one of the principal men of that syndicate in regard to matters of that company—

And by the way I may say here that Mr. Smart flatly denies that.

—which correspondence was maintained until it resulted in his being employed by that company. That is a nice condition of things, an officer of this department, in utter secrecy, makes a contract for a million dollars with a company that never existed but which he declared was a company and did exist, and after he has firmly settled that by a second order in council and fixed it, as he thought, for fourteen years, he makes his preparation to slip out of the department and enter into official connection and lucrative employment with the very company with which, under secrecy, he made these ruinous contracts.

The hon. gentleman says, 'under secrecy.' There is not a shadow of a shade of evidence in the official records, there is not a shadow of a shade of evidence given by any witness before the Public Accounts Committee or before the Agricultural Committee to justify the hon. gentleman in saying that Mr. Smart made this contract under secrecy. Let me illustrate, and I shall use my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) as an illustration, and I do not wish him to think I do so in any offensive way. Let me premise the illustration by saying that surely it is not a crime, surely it is not wrong for a man who has been employed in one of the public departments of government, after he has resigned his office to enter the employment of a company which had business relations with the department of which he had been an officer. My illustration is this—the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) when his party was in power was