

House should secure it, and therefore, I think, the motion should be carried.

Mr. DAVIN. The contention of the hon. gentleman who has moved this motion is, that after a public officer has been dismissed and after he has ceased entirely to be connected with the Government, if from any motive, wholly apart from the man, a motion of this sort is made, it ought to be agreed to. That is the contention of the hon. gentleman and it is also the contention of a far higher authority in this House, the leader of the Opposition. It is palpable that a great and grievous wrong might be done to a public officer if such a contention were allowed to prevail. A public officer who had served his country faithfully for some years might be guilty of an error or offence and be dismissed and have afterwards entered into some new undertaking and prospered in life, and yet from other motives altogether, because the hon. gentleman who has brought forward this motion says it has no connection with Mr. Creighton—

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman has no right to impute motives.

Mr. DAVIN. I imputed no motives.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I claim that no hon. gentleman has a right to impute motives to me.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not understand the hon. gentleman to impute motives to the hon. gentleman, the mover of this resolution. On the contrary, I understood that the hon. member was complaining that the hon. the mover of the resolution had stated no motive or reasons for the production of the papers voted for.

Mr. DAVIN. I imputed no motives whatever to the hon. gentleman. If he remembers the language he used when he proposed this motion, it was this. I will quote it from memory and I think I will quote it with tolerable exactness. He said that charges had been made against the Indian agents in the North-West; that this man Creighton had, according to rumor, been guilty of similar offences, and he wanted to have the information as to the circumstances attending the dismissal of Creighton brought down to the House. For what purpose? For any purpose connected with Creighton? Not at all. It was to throw some light on a question wholly apart from that. I say that if the principle that is behind the contention of the hon. gentleman were to be adopted in this House, a great wrong might be done to persons who would be placed in the position that their case might be dragged here on the floor of Parliament for no other purpose than to hit some body over their mangled carcase. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) laughs. On the question in the interest of which the subject is brought forward, he is about—I do not think it is an unparliamentary expression—the most benighted hon. member on that side of the House. Now, Sir, the hon. the leader of the Opposition takes what at first sight appears to be an unassailable position. I consider that the leader of the Opposition, in standing up and saying that this House has a perfect right to learn all about its officers, that it has a perfect right to know why an officer is dismissed, that it has a perfect right to know all about his conduct, to know what motive has governed Ministers in taking a given course, occupies an unassailable position. But when he is buttressing up the motion made by the hon. gentleman who brought forward this question, when he does not dissent from the reasons given by that hon. member for bringing forward this motion, he must be assumed to have adopted the reasoning of the hon. gentleman, and therefore he is in the same vulnerable position as that occupied by that hon. gentleman. That is to say, he occupies the ground that it is a fair and proper and right thing to ask for an enquiry into one circumstance in order to affect an end wholly apart from that.

This man Creighton has been dismissed from the service now for two years. It is perfectly clear that the position taken by the First Minister is a sound and wise and humane position; and not only that, but I venture to say it is a position which will be supported by parliamentary precedent. The right hon. gentleman says that if any one comes forward in the interests of Creighton, if Creighton complains, it would be a proper thing to accede to the request of the hon. member who brought the matter before the House; and although he does not go as fully into it, it is palpable that this was in his mind—that it would be an unjust thing if we were to go into an enquiry of this kind in order to accomplish a side issue. Now, Sir, I hope the House will not consent to the motion of the hon. member. If he wants to get the information on this subject that he seems to be so anxious about, the proper thing for him to do is to make a motion straight and above board. And let me say this: that if hon. gentlemen opposite wish to go into that question, there are now three or four members in this House that thoroughly understand it. And I can tell you that nothing helped to elect the four members who have been sent down here from the North-West Territories more than the mendacious, foul, unjust charges—

An hon. MEMBER. Draw it mild.

Mr. DAVIN. I really cannot draw it mild, because the offence was not mild.

Mr. WELSH. Go it strong then.

Mr. DAVIN. Nothing helped these members more in their election than the charges made against the Government policy in the North-West—and above all the charges with regard to Indian matters—by an hon. gentleman who is no longer in this House.

Mr. RYKERT. Ananias.

Mr. DAVIN. Is that what you call him here? I call him the late hon. member for Huron. His fate is to some extent deeply tragic; there was a sort of irony in it too, because his charges were the battle cry of the Reformers in the late election. He flung forth the boldest banner of all the lieutenants of the hon. gentleman opposite, and to day instead of crossing swords with the hon. member for Cumberland, or fighting the right hon. Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, he is politically dead.

Mr. McMULLEN. He will rise again.

Mr. DAVIN. Will he? At present he has been stretched on his bier in consequence of having had too much Porter—a most unheroic ending for a gallant political knight.

Mr. McMULLEN. It was the gerrymander.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, Mr. Speaker, let hon. members go into that question, and I can promise them that before they are through with it they will be heartily sick of the matter. But if the hon. gentleman wants information on these points let him boldly come forward and move a resolution which will bring them up. If I am not travelling beyond the record—and this point was raised by the hon. gentleman who brought forward this motion—I can tell the House that when those charges were first made about the conduct of these officials—charges with regard to the management of Indian affairs, starving Indians and so on, I went myself on a reservation, I saw the food which they had received, I had it cooked and I ate it, and all I can tell you is that the charges were excogitated out of the moral consciousness of Mr. M. C. Cameron.

An hon. MEMBER. Immoral consciousness.

Mr. DAVIN. I don't know whether it was immoral or not; I don't pry into these matters. I haven't the curiosity that excites the bosoms—the extremely fine bosoms—of hon. gentlemen.