

Mr. BOWELL. Order. I would remind the hon. gentleman that we are not in Committee, and for him to speak several times on this question is certainly contrary to the rule.

Mr. CHARLTON. The discussion should be allowed to proceed, and should not be stopped at this point, when it looks as if the Government were afraid of the matter being further discussed.

Mr. RYKERT. It was not even asked that this item should be fully discussed on Concurrence. The railway policy was the only matter left open for full discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have no knowledge of what occurred in Committee, and it is for the House itself to say whether it will allow its Rules to be suspended or superseded; but it is irregular for the hon. gentleman to speak more than once. It is unfortunate that the discussion was not taken in Committee.

Mr. PATERSON. What I stated was, that it was understood that we were to discuss this item; but when the Chairman of the Committee has stated that there was not any understanding to that effect, I feel it to be my duty to bow to his opinion.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). It is hardly fair, after the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue had made his statement, that the debate should be closed and a reply not allowed to be made from this side of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not recollect any instance on which so many items have been concurred in with so little waste of time as was the case this afternoon. If a few observations are desired to be made by hon. gentlemen it will be conceding the amenities of the occasion by not raising any objections to that course.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course, the hon. gentleman is perfectly correct when he says that Concurrence has progressed with much celerity. I think the Chairman of the Committee has stated the fact as it occurred; but, of course, if it is desired, on the other side, that there should be an answer given to the hon. Minister's statement, it is not unreasonable that this should be done.

Mr. LISTER. I only desire to say one word or two, and I can assure the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue that there is nothing further from my thoughts than to wound his feelings by word, act, or deed. I am here as a representative of a constituency, and I conceive it to be my duty to discuss this appointment. So far as the matter relates to Mr. Slattery, I desire to say that representations made by me the other evening that the appointment was made for the purpose then stated were based on information given to me. I do not retract the statement. I accept the explanation of Mr. Slattery; he said he did not circulate the pamphlets, and I have so stated to the House. I could not be asked to do less or more. I have simply discharged what I conceive to be my duty as a man having to some extent, at least, a sense of honor. I have before stated why this vacancy was not filled. Hon. gentlemen opposite would have the House understand that it was not filled out for economical reasons; that on the decease of the late collector the Government, with that economy which has always characterized it, did not fill up the office for the purpose of saving money. I have stated that the reason why the office was not filled up was that three out of the four of a committee appointed to recommend applicants to the Government had been applicants for the office themselves, and that the gentleman who opposed my colleague in East Lambton and who expected to have opposed me, found he could not get over the difficulty, and the office was abolished in order to obviate the difficulty. As I stated before, no saving has been effected, because what has been saved in that direction has been added to

Mr. COSTIGAN.

the expenses of the London division. If the division had remained as it was before the death of Mr. Glasher there would have been the same receipts, the work would have been the same, and the same number of officers would have been necessary. Since his death one man has discharged the duties of the office up to the appointment of the gentleman whose name has been so frequently mentioned; and the Minister says another appointment was necessary, and had been recommended. If it had been recommended, he should listen to the recommendation of the officer, and, under those circumstances, he probably is blameless; but it is difficult for the people of the county to understand why the appointment was made, they being familiar with the circumstances and the duties of the office, and the manner in which Mr. Elwood performed the duties in the past. I do not desire to prolong the discussion. I make these remarks, believing that what I am stating is substantially correct, and that the Minister is relieved of responsibility, because he has produced a recommendation from his chief officer; but I believe the appointment was not necessary.

On Resolution 183,

Canada Gazette.....\$4,500.00

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex). Were we not to have a statement concerning the revenue of the *Canada Gazette*?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I find that for the year 1881-82 the *Canada Gazette* reached 2,246 pages, an increase of 368 pages, and the expenditure a total of \$3,828.06, while the receipts were as follows:—The income for the same period was more than double that of the previous year, or \$3,084.42. Subscription and sales amounted to \$377.84, and advertising to \$2,706, making a total of \$3,084.72 of receipts against a cost of \$3,828.06,

On Resolution 201,

Weights, Measures and Gas.....\$73,000.00

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister on this occasion, whether any steps are to be taken with respect to the officers who were dismissed a few years ago, touching their payments into the Superannuation Fund. Many of these officers, when the service was organized in 1879 and 1880, were dismissed, and it seemed an injustice that they should not be refunded their contributions to the fund mentioned. I remember, that at the time I called the attention of the then hon. Minister, Mr. Baby, to the fact, and he promised to enquire into the circumstances; but I am not aware whether anything has been done in that respect since.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The matter has been under the consideration of the Government, and it will shortly be disposed of.

Mr. LAURIER. I am very glad to get this information. This subject cannot require a great deal of attention, and only needs looking into to discover what they contributed to that fund, which sums should be refunded.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think there should have been as long hesitation as there has been about this matter. Why, a number of men were appointed to different offices; and Parliament thought fit to abolish these offices. They had paid, meantime, into the Superannuation Fund. Now, under the law, if they had been in the service for a considerable time, the Ministry might have added a number of years to their period of service on the abolition of their offices, so as to give them a large superannuation. So favorably does the law consider the cases of those who are removed from the public service by the abolition of their offices, that this is the subject of a provision in the Superannuation Act. Now all that is asked by these persons who were removed out of the public service, because Parliament