

ledger. I want to point out one other thing. I am not going to take too strong ground with reference to the employment of relatives, but I do say this, that, if a relative is to be employed, he had better be employed in some other capacity than that of the responsible accountant of an office in a department of which the Minister to whom he is related is at the head. I say that it destroys, or has a tendency to destroy, the proper discipline of the department, when a son, or a brother, or a cousin, of the Minister who runs the department is put in the responsible office of accountant for that same department. Whether it influences the Minister or not, it will have the tendency in the department to make the other employees believe that it does influence him. This gentleman may be very capable, but my hon. friend is knocking to the winds the rule that hon. gentlemen opposite strove for during all the years they were in Opposition. He superannuated the former accountant, and gave him \$1,680 superannuation allowance, and put in his place a new and untried man at the very same salary that the former accountant received, while he refuses the \$50 increase to the deserving clerks who are entitled to it under the Act.

Mr. QUINN. I cannot help congratulating the Minister of Militia on having the power to put his relative into this position and on having set aside the law of the land to secure a position for him that would be sufficiently remunerative, and to secure for the country such eminent services. I look at the list of civil servants, in connection with the Department of Militia and Defence, I would like to call the attention of the hon. the Solicitor General to the names. I am glad to see the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) present, because he is the hero probably, of the system. I would like to call the attention of the Solicitor General and also the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Hurley), who I see, is here, the hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. McHugh), and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Stenson), while I read the names of the three leading officers in this list. I quote from page 15 :

Col. Charles Eugène Panet—present rank, Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence; date, 4th February, 1875; present salary, \$3,200; date of birth, 17th November, 1830; date of first appointment, 4th February, 1875.

Lt.-Col. John Macpherson—present rank, chief clerk, director of stores; date, 25th April, 1891; present salary, \$3,000; date of birth, 8th January, 1830; date of first appointment, 1st September, 1872.

Cornwall Herbert O'Meara—present rank, chief clerk, accountant; date, 1st July, 1881; present salary, \$2,400; date of birth, 25th May, 1833; date of first appointment, 1st June, 1861.

So that, of course, the relative of the Minister of Militia and Defence must be provided for. It is very unfortunate, and I draw the attention of the Solicitor Gen-

Mr. FOSTER.

eral and the other gentlemen to whom I have referred to it, that a man named O'Meara should be displaced, but it is quite usual. I draw their attention to this fact that it is quite in keeping with the system, or rather the theory that has been broached by the Minister of Public Works in that famous newspaper of his, and of course I am glad to see it followed. I am sure these gentlemen will enjoy it, and I hope they will vote to support the decision that Cornwall Herbert O'Meara, a principal officer of the Militia Department, who, on the admission of the Minister of Militia was dismissed or superannuated, not because he was too old; not because he was not faithful in the discharge of his duties; not because there was anything dishonest about him, but he was superannuated and Mr. Borden replaced him probably only because his name was O'Meara.

Mr. McINERNEY. I would like to call attention to one thing. I have not risen to find fault with the appointment of Mr. Borden to this position, nor have I risen to find fault because Mr. Borden happens to be the cousin of the hon. Minister. I do not make any point against the Minister on that account. But he has brought into his department a new man as accountant, giving him a salary of \$2,400. Now when we run over these Estimates of the amounts paid to the accountants of the different departments, we find that in the Department of the Interior, the accountant is paid \$2,350, the Department of Indian Affairs \$1,950, the Department of Marine and Fisheries \$1,800, the Department of Public Works—it has been reduced from \$2,400—\$1,800.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a new appointment, I suppose.

Mr. McINERNEY. I suppose so. The accountant in the Department of Railways and Canals receives \$2,000, and the accountant in the Post Office Department \$1,800. So that we have a brand new man brought into the Militia Department at a higher salary than the accountant of any other department.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the hon. Minister what was the salary given to the clerk in question before his appointment, and also why Mr. O'Meara was incapacitated? The hon. Minister must bear in mind that it must appear strange that a previous clerk should be set aside at an expense to the country of \$1,600 a year, that a relative of his own should be taken into his own department at a salary of \$2,400, and that he should claim that he would not come here for any less. What was he getting then?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not know that I am bound or that I am in a position to state. I have stated already that this gentleman told me that he was receiving what he con-