

third less pay than the men we sent up; so that we are paying at least one-third more than that labour is worth in the open market in Dawson. I think that fact conclusively disposes of the charge that we underpay the officials. My hon. friend the member for Pictou said that we had treated Judge Maguire abominably, that he was dreadfully ill-used. The member for Pictou does not agree with the judge in that respect, because I have in my office a letter from Judge Maguire, thanking me and thanking the Government for the great kindness and consideration which had been shown to him during his period of service in the Yukon district.

Now, I am going to take up another witness of my hon. friend the member for Pictou. It is tedious, but we will go through the whole of them and see what their evidence is worth. I have gone through his statement and I find something specific, something that we can get hold of, something that we can check, and see what his evidence is worth. This is one of the anonymous statements, and, Mr. Speaker, mark this, because one has to follow it closely in order to get at the gravamen of the charge. This man, speaking of the lease of the waiver front, says:

According to the terms of this lease, the lessees did not have to pay rent to the Government for any of the water front until the same was occupied by their lessees, thus incurring no responsibility whatever.

Of course, if an officer of the Government had made a lease of that kind he would either be a fool or a knave; there is no doubt about that. There could not be the least question about that; he would be either a fool or a knave, because to put himself under contract to somebody else, without payment being provided for until the rent is collected, would not be a business transaction, and he would be either a fool or knave. Perhaps that language is too strong, but it would not be a business-like transaction. But, Mr. Speaker, there is not a word of truth in it. The papers are here; I will lay them on the Table of the House, and the lease is there. The lease is by letter, and there is not a solitary word of truth in the statement. I cannot take all the statements that these men make; of course there are many that are mere flourishes, mere diatribes—"Mall and Empire" editorials and Ottawa, "Citizen" editorials; but here and there we come across a statement that we can get hold of. Of course, we cannot check them all; I have not the information, but I have the information to check some of them, and I am bound to say that in regard to any of them in which I have the papers I am in a position to show that they are untrue. This same unnamed gentleman who made that statement which was shown to be untrue, says that he is informed that Mr. Wade received \$1,500 for giving somebody—he does not say whom—the exclusive privilege of

maintaining a booth in the Klondike. He says that he was so informed. The man who makes this statement is the man who makes the statement that I have shown to be absolutely untrue. Of course we are unable to check his statement that he was informed by somebody else whose name was not given that Mr. Wade was bribed. But I would like to ask my hon. friend who is going to follow me, the member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), what importance he would attach to evidence of that kind.

There is another witness, Mr. Woodworth. Mr. Woodworth writes a long letter; he does not deal in specific statements, there is nothing that one can get hold of definitely, but he is very violent in his abuse of me and generally of the policy of the Government. The hon. member for Pictou was not in a position to give any information as to who Mr. Woodworth was, and apparently he had not taken any trouble to inquire. He just brings in Mr. Woodworth's letter and reads it, apparently without making any inquiry as to whether this man was a reliable man or a man of character or repute. I think that when an hon. gentleman comes in and asks Parliament to act upon the statement of somebody, he ought to take some little pains to find out what kind of a man it is whom he cites as his authority. He has given us the statements of a lot of men whose names he has not mentioned, and he wants us to take their statements because he says he made inquiry and found them to be reliable. Now, we have a man here whose name is given, and I am going to give the result of the inquiry which I have made as to whether this man is reliable or not. I find one statement here, and I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that this gentleman is a lawyer, and in speaking about a legal matter, he cannot be excused for not telling what is true. We will check up this gentleman; we will check up his reliability on a question of fact, and see what his evidence is worth. The acknowledged method of dealing with a witness is to take his statements one by one and see whether what he tells is true or not. We have not time to check up all this gentleman's statements one by one, but I have them here. Of course, he calls our officials inefficient, but this is a matter of opinion; it is not a question of fact. He says:

A Mr. Thiell—

The name is Snell; he is the clerk of the court, and Thiell is apparently a misprint.

—is clerk of the court, but, being without legal training, he is incompetent to take examinations, tax costs and do all that is required of a clerk of court.

There is a straight statement that a man who is clerk of the court is not efficient. Now, I have here an application from Mr. Snell, who is the same man, to Mr. Ogilvie that he might be permanently appointed as