

not secretary of the department? I saw something in 'The Globe' the other day, saying that Mr. Foster should not use such words as 'thieves and embezzlers in the public service to-day.' Not one of the four ministers beside my hon. friend will deny this case, it has all been threshed out. He is the second most important to the deputy minister, in the department and there he sits to-day. There is a power behind these men which prevents their being put out of office. I am not blaming the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) for it, for he has only recently come into the department. It is the fault of the system that has gone on. Let me tell the Minister of Public Works that one thing he will find in the department is the sworn testimony of a man who was paid \$3.50 a day to inspect dredge scows to see that they were filled with mud. This man cheerfully swore that he had not been near these scows and knew nothing about them, and also that an official on an adjoining scow had taken from him \$1 a day for keeping it quiet. I can tell the minister that he will find an awful crowd when he goes among his people in the province of Ontario. If he will look up the tenders for the work at Port Arthur and Fort William, he will find that one firm put in two tenders under different names with the idea that, if there were no intervening tenders, the minister would be able to draw out the lower tender and let the work at the higher price. The Minister of Public Works is new to this arena.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I want to learn all I can.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, he will learn many things that will surprise him very much if he has been where matters were run fairly and above board. He should look up the evidence in respect to the Gelinac correspondence. Claims were made for pay for officers in the department. The pay-list was demanded by the Auditor General before he would pass the account. But the pay-list was not produced—I assume because it would prove that the claim was not an honest and straightforward one. All I can say, so far as this man Jackson and this man Preston are concerned is that, it would be more creditable for the country if both were out of the public service and decent men put in their places.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I may say for the information of the department that in the settlement of the seizure of the Chatham Cordage Company, settled on the 24th of February, I have the check to Mr. Haycock, giving him \$67.50; the check to M. Houston, who was the magistrate in the case, \$300.02; and check to Alex. Smith for \$245.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is he?

Mr. CLEMENTS. He is the Liberal organizer for the province of Ontario. I asked last year what the total expenses
Mr. BENNETT.

were, and the amount was given to me as being \$349.02. I immediately wrote to the manager of the Cordage Company, Mr. Wilson, and he wrote me back saying that the settlement cost him \$612.52. Now, I would like to know—and I hope the minister will go into the matter—why Mr. Alex. Smith could go up there in this capacity and extract \$245 from Mr. Wilson.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a proper matter for inquiry. But what struck me as remarkable is that this is a matter which is at least three years old. If Mr. Wilson felt that he had a grievance, I should think he would have made a complaint to the minister. Is my hon. friend Mr. Clements aware whether he did so or not?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I may give the facts which will explain to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) why this matter was not gone into before. This seizure took place at a time when the elections were spoken of. There was a short session, and the elections followed, and this seizure took place just prior to the time when the elections were to come off. Mr. Wilson and the whole management of the concern, some of them relatives of my own, were strong Conservatives. This seemed to be the only concern seized at that time. They realized the position that the seizure placed them in, and thought that if they wanted to do business they had better 'let sleeping dogs lie.' But the factory is now out of business and the machinery sold. The men concerned are anxious that the matter should be gone into. It was put into my hands last year, and I was going to bring it up in the Public Accounts Committee. But the session closed earlier than was expected and I left it over until this session.

Mr. FIELDING. But has the management ever made any representation to any minister of the Crown explaining this transaction. There are thousands of officials acting for the government. While it is quite possible something may occur which would give just cause of complaint, I would expect the party aggrieved to take the earliest possible opportunity of making his grievance known to the minister. If he made that complaint, and that complaint were not fairly dealt with, he would then be quite justified in bringing the matter up in this House.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The manager of the concern gave this matter into my hands. Mr. Wilson is prepared to come here and give evidence of the whole case if that privilege is accorded him.

Mr. FIELDING. But that does not meet the point. Did Mr. Wilson make representations to the Minister of Trade and Commerce or any other minister complaining of having been wrongly treated? How could the government be blamed for not