

Canada. Parl. H. of C. Select
Standing Committee on Public
Accounts, 1891.

Report and minutes of
evidence. c.1

DATE	NAME - NOM
	Canada, Parl. House of Commons, Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

J
103
H7
1891
P81
A12

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

REPORT

AND

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

RESPECTING CERTAIN PAYMENTS MADE BY THE

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

FOR

EXTRA SERVICES.

1891.



OTTAWA:
PRINTED BY BROWN CHAMBERLIN, PRINTER TO THE QUEEN'S MOST
EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

1891.

REPORT.

The Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, beg leave to present the following as their

TWENTY-SEVENTH REPORT:

Your Committee have had under consideration certain accounts of the Department of the Interior, showing the amounts paid for salaries and for extra work performed from the 1st July, 1884, to the 1st July, 1891, and in connection therewith have examined witnesses under oath, and for the information of the House report herewith the evidence given by such witnesses.

All which is respectfully submitted.

N. CLARKE WALLACE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ROOM,
MONDAY, 21st September, 1891.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

TAKEN BEFORE THE SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC
ACCOUNTS, RESPECTING THE PAYMENTS MADE BY
THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR FOR
EXTRA SERVICES.

COMMITTEE ROOM, WEDNESDAY, 8th July, 1891.

Committee met, Mr. WALLACE in the Chair.

Mr. J. LORN McDUGALL, Auditor General, called and examined :—

By Mr. Somerville :

1. Do you know a person by the name of Low in the Department of the Interior?—I know one person by that name.

2. A. P. Low?—Yes.

3. Was he promoted recently?—He was appointed recently to the permanent staff.

4. Was there not some trouble about his appointment?—Well, yes; there was some delay about it.

5. What caused the delay?—He had been paid out of the outside vote—the vote to which those cheques are charged for which you asked—and my view of the law was, at the time, that the clause in the Civil Service Act under which an extra clerk could be appointed to the permanent staff at his average salary for the last two years did not apply to persons employed as Mr. Low was, and I objected to his being placed on the permanent staff. I may say this, that there was an appeal from my decision to the Treasury Board, as in all such cases, and I was overruled. I may say also that my opinion, after thinking over the matter, is that the view I first took is wrong. My view at first was that the only persons entitled to the privilege of being appointed to the permanent staff were the extra clerks paid out of the Civil Service contingencies.

By Mr. Foster :

6. As being in the service before 1882?—Yes; this matter is perhaps a little complicated to people giving it attention for the first time. The Civil Service Act says that any person who is in the service before July, 1882, would be exempt from examination, and could be appointed at the average salary for the last two years, that is, appointed to a permanent position—I took it that this clause did not apply to persons not paid out of Civil Government Contingencies. The Treasury Board overruled my view, and in that I believe now the Treasury Board were right. Under the view that I took at first those persons who are employed and paid out of this vote were not subject to any of the restrictions of the Civil Service Act—that is to say, they could be paid any salary the Government choose to pay, provided there was the appropriation. You are aware that the persons paid out of Civil Government Contingencies cannot be paid, except for special service, more than \$400 a year, but I think that Parliament, in making a special vote to pay for extra clerks outside gave to the Government the

right to pay to such persons any remuneration that the Government pleased, and to keep them as long as they desired. It was in that way that I objected to Mr. Low being made a permanent clerk, as I did not think the clause in the Civil Service Act applied to such cases as his.

By Mr. Somerville :

7. Mr. Low occupies the position to which he was appointed?—He does now.

By Mr. Bowell :

8. You state, Mr. McDougall, that the Treasury Board's action was based on the opinion of the Minister of Justice?—That is always so; that is part of the law. The Minister of Justice always gives an opinion before the Treasury Board can overrule the decision of the Auditor.

9. The Civil Service Act also provides, does it not, that a person continuously in the employ of the Government since 1882 can be placed on the permanent list under that decision at the salary he was receiving at the time?—Yes; his average salary for the last two years.

10. And not the minimum salary, \$400?—No; of course, under that decision of the Treasury Board every extra clerk, as long as he is paid as an extra clerk, must be paid equal to \$400, unless he came in before 1882.

Mr. J. A. PINARD called and examined :

By Mr. Somerville :

11. What position do you occupy in the Department of the Interior?—Accountant.

12. You have the attendance books in connection with your Department, have you not?—Yes, sir.

13. This is it, is it not? (Identifying book.)—This is the one in connection with my branch—the Accountant's staff.

14. Are those all the employés you have under you whose names appear here?—Yes; all that were on the pay-list; those who are receiving monthly salaries.

15. And the outside vote?—Yes, sir; they are included—the extra clerks as well as the permanent officers.

16. And they all sign this book?—Certainly—that is, the clerks, any of those you have in this list. Some get monthly salaries and others get pay for work which is done outside.

17. Those that get pay for work done outside are not in your charge?—They do not sign the books.

18. Do they sign any books?—I am not aware that they sign any books.

19. Who keeps account of their work?—That is done in other offices of the Department; not in my office.

20. Do you know in what office the account is kept?—The accounts, as far as the moneys which are paid out, are kept with me.

21. No; I mean the work?—It depends on the nature of the work that is done.

22. Copying work?—Most of the copying is done under Mrs. Lee.

23. It is sometimes done by the hour?—That is extra work. Extra work is given to officers who are paid monthly; of course, where extra work is mentioned the names should appear in some of the books as extra work. It is given to officers who are working under salary; but there is also extra work, such as copying, given to people entirely outside of the staff.

24. Then the man who does extra work ought to have his name in some of the attendance books?—I should think so. Extra work is given, in addition to the ordinary salary received, for work performed after hours.

25. Do you know a man in the Department named Joseph Wright?—I do not know Joseph Wright.

26. Do you see his name here? "Extra work, 475 hours, at 50 cents." That is at page 34-B of the Auditor General's Report. Do you not know Joseph Wright?—No; I do not know Joseph Wright.

27. You ought to know who are in the employ of the Department in that branch?—I must say that some of them I have never spoken to. I have seen the name on the list, but I do not know all the officers. I know my own staff, of course. That is a case out of the regular routine.

28. It is extra work, is it not?—That is true.

29. You do not know this man at all, Mr. Pinard?—No, sir.

30. Have you never heard of him?—Certainly I have heard of him this way, the accounts come through my office.

31. Who certifies to the work that he does, or his attendance in the Department, extra work, at so much per hour?—The accounts would come to me in the usual way. After I receive the account a cheque is issued from my office after the account is approved.

32. It is difficult for me to know how these things are done, and I am somewhat in the dark. I must depend on you to enlighten me?—I will explain to you how the accounts are paid, and then you can deduce from that, so as to arrive at a conclusion. That account will be paid through the Accountant's office, as all the accounts are paid. The account is filed in the Department, certified and approved. That is the rule for all accounts. They are certified outside of my office entirely.

33. Certified by whom?—All accounts that are paid are supposed to be certified by the party who knows the work to have been done; they are then approved by the Deputy.

34. Who signs the cheque then?—I sign the cheque after the account comes to me. You will find all the cheques there have been signed by me, unless some of them have been signed in my absence by the Assistant Accountant.

35. Here is a cheque made to the order of Joseph Wright?—That is signed by me and Mr. Hall. I would presume that in that special case the account has been approved by Mr. Hall, as he signed the cheque. It may have been approved by Mr. Burgess. There is a standing rule in my office; of course there may be exceptions, and there were some years ago; but within the last year or so all the accounts that have been paid have been certified and approved. I do not go any further than that in paying accounts.

36. It is not your business to examine the account?—Not at all. The moment I get an account certified and approved it is my duty to issue the cheque.

37. Of course you could not identify this as Joseph Wright's signature, because you do not know the man?—Not at all.

38. Do you know a Miss Nellie Myers in the Department?—I know there is a young lady of that name.

39. She is credited with having worked 240 days at \$1.50 a day, and received \$363. Do you know her?—Miss Nellie Myers, as far as my memory tells me—in the statement I made a few minutes ago—this name brings a matter up in connection with it. There may be some accounts, and I think this is one of them, where clerical work is done by persons who do not sign the book, but who render their monthly accounts.

40. Who do not sign the attendance book?—Yes; and who render monthly accounts. In that case the account would come in in the same way as the others, certified and approved.

41. Would that work be done in the offices of the Department?—I could not say that.

42. Where would Miss Nellie Myers be working during that time? Would she not be required to be in the office?—That I do not know; I never saw her.

43. Do you know a Miss Jane Hay?—No; I do not.

44. Do you know a Miss A. Duhamel?—No; I do not. I may have seen Miss Duhamel; I think I did see her in the Department.

By Mr. Bowell :

45. Do I understand you to say that the parties that are on the regular staff sign the book if they do extra work at night?—I did not mean that; I did not intend that my expression should give you that understanding. There were a few cases like that of Miss Myers', who did not sign the attendance book.

46. I am not speaking of that point at all. You stated that there were parties on the permanent staff who did extra work by the hour, and their names should be in the book?—We have two classes of employés, the permanent officials, who are paid out of Civil Government, and those who are paid out of Dominion Lands Income. These are the extra clerks.

47. What I want the Committee to understand is this: is it necessary in the case of a permanent clerk doing extra work after hours, and who is paid extra for it that he should sign the attendance book at any other time than in the morning when he comes?—All that I know is that all the clerks sign the attendance book.

48. But if a man ends his employment of the regular day's work at 4 o'clock, and after dinner, say, he is engaged for three hours, does he sign the book in the evening?—He only signs the attendance book in the morning.

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

49. What hours do they sign the attendance book?—Generally half-past nine. That is the hour it should be signed.

50. How long does it remain open for signature?—Until ten o'clock.

51. At ten o'clock what do you do with it?—The book is put away.

By Mr. Somerville :

52. They are all apparently very regular in their attendance.—The book speaks for itself. I am as careful as possible in seeing the attendance is kept up.

53. You do not know Mr. Wright?—No.

Mr. A. M. BURGESS called and examined:—

By Mr. Somerville :

54. Do you know why Mr. Wright is not here, Mr. Burgess?—Yes; I can tell you. I am glad to have the opportunity to tell the Committee just exactly what there is in this Wright matter, because I can clearly see for one thing that Mr. Pinard did not quite understand some of the questions put to him. He was asked, for instance, whether all these people signed the attendance book, and he replied that they did. I ought to state to the Committee that for a number of years past a large number of people have been working for the Department, particularly in 1885, 1886 and 1887, for whom I could not find any accommodation in the Government building. As it stands at present, one-half of the staff is at present located over the Bank of Ottawa—the technical branch—and nearly all the extra work done in the Department has been done outside. It has been taken by people to their own homes, and the work counted by Mrs. Lee or the officer under whose superintendence it is performed, and certified to by the officers who examine it. It is paid for sometimes at so much per hour, sometimes per folio, dependant on the nature of the work to be done. If it was copying at so much per folio; the person who gave it out would see that the work was properly done and certify to it; if at so much per hour, the chief clerk or other responsible officer under whom the work was done would also certify the account after which I would approve, as the Accountant has explained. It is then sent to the Accountant who would draw the cheque, which would be signed by himself and by me, or in my absence by the Acting Deputy.

By Mr. Foster :

55. When you pay at so much per hour how do you count the hour?—That must be done under supervision in a private room. The history of the Joseph Wright

case in this: In 1883, when I became Deputy Minister of the Interior, I found that no account had been kept of the scrip, military bounty and mounted police warrants issued from time to time, nor had any account been kept of these warrants and scrip which had been paid into the Department in payment for land. I called the attention of the Accountant, Mr. Pinard, who received his appointment at the same time as myself, to this state of matters, and said to him I thought that we should open a book of accounts in regard to scrip and warrants, exactly the same as if they were cash. He concurred in this view, and immediately opened such a book, or rather, set of books. I told him at the same time that I thought the whole of the work of the past in regard to this particular matter should be examined and the accounts brought up to date. Several years elapsed when Mr. Pinard reported to me that he had not sufficient staff to overtake this work, which was naturally very onerous, from the beginning up to the 1st of July, 1883. The Honourable Thomas White was then Minister of Interior. I discussed the subject with him, and suggested that one of two things should be done: either that an expert accountant should be employed from outside to go into the work from the beginning, or that some one in the employ of the Department, competent to do the work, should be given it as a special job. He asked which I thought would be the most satisfactory, and at the same time the most economical, mode of doing the work; to which I replied that in my opinion some clerk in the Accountant's office, or in the office of the Chief Clerk of Patents where the information was to be found, should be appointed to do the work as either of them would know the routine of the Department better than an outsider. He asked me whom I thought would be the best person to employ, and told me to look and see and select the man whom in my judgment was best fitted for the work. After a time we decided that H. H. Turner, a third-class clerk in the Accountant's office, and a man getting a small salary, would be the best man for the work. I told Mr. White that I thought it would take some years to do this work, and meantime it was necessary to arrive at some understanding as to how the man should be paid. Fifty cents an hour was what was allowed for extra work, and Mr. White and myself agreed that Turner could not in any case earn more than the maximum salary of the class to which he belonged. The question arose as to how he was to be paid, and I mentioned that in the Post Office Department and the Finance Department at the end of the year certain permanent clerks are allowed the opportunity to earn something extra by making computations and other work necessary to the speedy closing of the accounts, and I said I would find out how these were paid. I do not remember whether I did or not, but the conclusion we arrived at was, that in reference to this work, especially that which he could do at his own house, Turner would need assistance. The idea was that he would take his facts and figures out of the books in rough form, and then get them out at his own house. His wife was a clever woman; she had been a school teacher in Ontario. I do not know whether the suggestion came from Mr. White or not, but for a number of years it was going on with the consent of Mr. White, or the chief clerk of the Department, that this money was to be for Mr. Turner's benefit, because he was the one who did the work. Turner had the misfortune to lose his wife, and then the account was put in the name of a friend. I did not know of that change for a considerable time after it took place, but I did know in course of time that it was done.

By Mr. Foster:

56. It was in the name of his wife while she lived?—Yes.

By Mr. Somerville:

57. What was her name?—I do not know.

58. How long is it since she died?—I do not know really what was the wife's name. She had a sister here; it may have been in her's.

59. How long is it since his wife died?—Four or five years. It must be subsequent to 1884 since this commenced.

60. How did you come to adopt the name of Joseph Wright?—I did not adopt it; he adopted it himself, I understand.

61. Who is Joseph Wright?—I understand he is a friend of Mr. Turner's. I may say to the Committee that it is only within the last few days that my attention was called to this. All I know is, that the work was done and the Auditor was furnished with the results of this man's labour.

62. How could the work be given out to a man who apparently had no existence?—Of course the man has existence.

By Mr. Sproule:

63. Might it not have been given to Turner, who employed Wright?—I suppose it was. I spoke to Turner about it yesterday and I asked him about it. I can only say that I was anxious about the work. I know from time to time that it was going on as I could see the results of it.

By Mr. Somerville:

64. That system of doing business might lead to a great deal of trouble?—I quite agree with you. There is no doubt about it that the regular mode would have been to come down to Parliament and ask Parliament to vote this additional remuneration.

65. Why was that not done?—For the simple reason that a portion of the work had to be done with assistance.

66. What salary did Turner get?—I think \$600 at that time.

67. I see that last year he got \$862.50?—Probably he would be only getting \$500 at that time.

By Mr. Sproule:

68. He would be getting steady increases since?—Yes.

By Mr. Somerville:

69. As far as you know, there is no Mr. Joseph Wright?—As far as I know, except for Turner's putting the account in his name; that is all I know.

70. You know it would be contrary to the Civil Service Act to allow Turner to draw this money?—I do not think it occurred to me before that this was the case.

71. You know no permanent clerk is allowed to draw anything beyond his salary, except on Order in Council or through the Supplementary Estimates?—That is quite true.

Mr. BOWELL—Not even by Order in Council.

By Mr. Foster:

72. Are you satisfied that the extra work was done?—I know it was.

73. How do you know?—I could show you from the records of the Department. Anyone can understand it when he comes to know what work this man was doing. He had to enter up all the scrip that had been issued and all the warrants, and it was a very laborious task, as millions of dollars had been paid in in this way.

74. Since when?—From the beginning. I suppose the first scrip was issued in 1883.

By Mr. Somerville:

75. I cannot understand why, when a man was giving good service for the work he was performing that any back-door method of payment should have to be adopted?—I frankly state that I do not think it is a very defensible thing myself. I say to the Committee that I took full responsibility; but there is no secret about it—everybody in the Department knew it was being done and who was doing it.

76. And all this time H. H. Turner was pocketing this money?—I cannot say he was pocketing it; he really earned it.

By Mr. Denison :

77. Could he only have done this work after hours?—He could only do it after hours, because the books in the possession of the Department were in use during the day. If an expert accountant had been brought in he could only have worked after hours, because the books were in constant use during the day.

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

78. This money credited to Joseph Wright was paid to H. H. Turner?—I so understood.

By Mr. Foster :

79. For working after hours?—Yes; and for assistance.

By Mr. Somerville :

80. Are you aware whether he got assistance or not?—I certainly understood that he did. Of course, I did not go to his house to see.

81. But you did not know whether his wife did any?—Truly, truly; but I knew the work was done.

By Mr. Corby :

82. And it cost you less than if you had employed an expert?—It did not cost us one-half what it would have cost the other way.

By Mr. Somerville :

83. Why did you not have the work done according to the requirements of the Civil Service Act, and save this enquiry? There must have been some reason for it?—No reason in the world, except my anxiety to get the work done. It was in the middle of the season, and I could not have got a cent for it until the meeting of Parliament.

84. Could not the Minister have employed another man?—He could have employed an outsider, but as Turner was able to do the work better than any other outsider I preferred he should get it. I have no hesitation in saying that if I had to begin again this would not be done.

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

85. The law had been deliberately violated and with the consent of his chief?—Certainly I never paid a cent without the concurrence of the Department.

By Mr. Bowell :

86. What I understand the position to be is this: During the life of Mrs. Turner the account was paid to her. After her death the work was continued to be done at Mr. Turner's house?—Partly at the house and partly at the office, just as before.

87. And after his wife's death Mr. Turner put in the accounts in the name of Mr. Wright? Did you know whether Mr. Turner, in order to evade the provisions of the Civil Service Act substituted another name for the work done by himself, and then took the money?—I must say I never asked him that.

88. Or whether Mr. Wright really did the work under the superintendence of Mr. Turner and then Mr. Turner put in the account in the name of Mr. Wright, or whether did he do it to evade the law?—I did not think of it.

By Mr. Somerville :

89. If Mr. Turner did the work himself, the theory Mr. Bowell sets up may be accepted somewhat; but if Turner gave the work to this man Joseph Wright, then it

was not because Mr. Turner was eminently fitted to do the work that it was given to him?—It was because he was fitted for the work that it was given to him. First of all, the facts and figures had to be extracted from the books, which only an officer of the Department or an expert accountant could have done. Turner is a good accountant; his wife, I understand, was to do the tabulation, which was to be written out at his own house.

90. Sir Richard Cartwright stated that this had been done with the consent and approbation of the chief of the Department?—Yes; when it was in Turner's wife's name.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant):

91. Who certified to Joseph Wright's account?—I think the chief clerk of the Patent Branch.

By Mr. Somerville:

92. Here are Mr. Turner's cheques (producing cheques). Do you know his handwriting?—I do.

93. Is that anything like it (handing cheque to witness)?—That is not like it.

94. Because this man Joseph Wright has no existence; some one has written his name on the cheque?—All that I can say is, that after I issued the cheque I had no more responsibility.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant):

95. Whom were Joseph Wright's cheques given to?—They were given to Turner. I do not want the Committee to be under any misapprehension; I knew perfectly that Turner was getting paid for this work. I do not say that I knew of this at the time Wright's name was first used that Joseph Wright represented this particular work, but it was to pay for the work.

96. Did you know that Joseph Wright was a real person or a fictitious person?—To this moment I did not know; I never knew about it.

97. Why should he use Joseph Wright's name?—There is no earthly reason for it, except that it was a well-understood rule that he could not get extra pay in his own name, unless it were voted by Parliament.

By Mr. Foster:

98. He could not get the cheque for himself?—No; for the very good reason that the Auditor-General would not pass it.

By Sir Richard Cartwright:

99. He was violating the law, and has been doing it for years?—There is no doubt that there has been a technical violation of the law.

By Mr. Somerville:

100. I think there was a gross violation?—I do not think it was a violation when the work was actually done.

101. Can we see this work that was done?—Certainly.

102. Well I will ask you to bring it for the next meeting. Now there are some other persons whom I have been informed—I am only acting on information from other persons, and I have to substantiate it by the evidence I have to bring forward—Do you know a Miss Agnes Duhamel?—I do; well.

103. Is she in the employ of the Department now?—Not now.

104. When did she cease to be in the employ of the Department?—I do not remember, but the last time that payment was made to her would be shown in the Public Accounts.

105. I see in the attendance book there is the signature Agnes Duhamel, under date 20th April, 1889?—That is her name.

106. She signed this attendance book all through—this book commencing the 1st March, 1889, up to—

Mr. CHAIRMAN—31st August, 1889.

Mr. SOMERVILLE—But she ceased to sign the book before that. Now if you look at this signature (pointing to book) Agnes Duhamel, and compare it with her signature in another place, Agnes Duhamel, they are not in the same handwriting?—I think they are. I assure you she was working in the Department up to August 1889.

107. This second signature does not look like the lady's handwriting at all. She was in the Department employed up to August you say?—Up to that time. I may say to you that Miss Agnes Duhamel is a niece of the Archbishop of Ottawa.

108. We don't care anything about that?—Except that it will be a test of her respectability.

109. I am not talking about her respectability?—I thought that you were doubting the signature.

By Mr. Bowell :

110. Has Miss Duhamel received any pay since she left in August, 1889?—No, sir; she has not.

By Mr. Somerville :

111. My information is that Miss Duhamel has not been in the Department for over two years—that she has been in Paris, France, studying music?—If the man who says that professes to say that of his own knowledge he deliberately lies.

By Mr. Denison :

112. Has she been drawing pay since August, 1889?—She has not.

By Mr. McMullen :

113. What particular work was she doing?—She was copying in Mrs. Lee's office—copying letters for signature.

By Mr. Somerville :

114. Here is one of Miss Duhamel's cheques. You will see that it is endorsed Agnes Duhamel. Will you say whether the same party who wrote the endorsement on the cheque is the same one who wrote the signature in the time-book? Do you think the person who signed the cheque signed the attendance book?—I could not say as to that. All I know is, that Miss Duhamel was actually working in the Department of the Interior up to the time she ceased to be paid, and that the cheques were issued in her name. This lady actually worked the same as the rest of the ladies did from day to day in Mrs. Lee's office.

By Mr. McMullen :

115. She may have done so; but submit the two signatures to an expert, and he would not say they were the same?—Well, I know this, that Miss Duhamel came to the office every day and at the time she is marked for. I saw her from day to day.

H. H. TURNER called and examined :—

By Mr. Somerville :

116. What is your position in the Interior Department?—I keep the ledgers, sir.

117. There appears in the Auditor-General's Report an amount paid to Joseph Wright for extra work, \$237.50, and I understand from Mr. Burgess, the Deputy Minister, that you are the party that has got this money?—Yes; I got that money.

118. How did it come that you entered it in Joseph Wright's name?—In the first place, before my wife died——

119. Just a moment. When did your wife die?—Unfortunately, I have lost both. It was my first wife who did the work, and after she died the name of Joseph Wright was substituted for hers. He went to the old country, and I believe is since dead.

120. When did she die?—About five years ago. I married again and lost my second wife.

121. It was after your first wife died that you substituted Joseph Wright's name for that of your first wife?—Just that.

122. How long has Joseph Wright been dead?—I said I believed he is dead.

123. How long is it since he went to the old country?—About a year, I think.

124. What was he employed at in the city while here?—He was not employed at anything.

125. Did he live with you?—He did not live with me.

126. Was he a man of means?—Well, no; not a man of any great means.

127. He must have had some way of living?—Yes; I suppose he had. I only saw him occasionally.

128. How often did you used to see him?—Not every often.

129. Did he ever do any of this work?—Certainly not. He is a connection of my first wife's. He never did any of the work; that is what suggested it to me.

130. Who suggested it to you to put it in the name of some other person?—I do not know.

131. It must have been somebody?—I think the suggestion came from Mr. Douglas.

132. What Mr. Douglas?—He was at that time the Assistant Secretary of the Department. I think the suggestion came from him.

133. Did you submit Mr. Douglas' suggestion to anybody?—No, sir.

134. Then you adopted that name from that out?—Yes.

135. Here are Joseph Wright's cheques. Who signed the name on the backs of the cheques?—I did.

136. You put Joseph Wright's name there?—I did.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant):

137. Have you a power of attorney from Joseph Wright?—No.

By Mr. Bowell:

138. Had you any authority from Joseph Wright to do that?—Oh, yes.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant):

139. Do you not think that was rather a queer way of doing business?—I suppose it was like this. There was the work, the work was done, nobody can dispute that; it was work done until 12 o'clock at night and often until 2 o'clock in the morning.

By Mr. Somerville:

140. Would it not have been better for you and for the Department, and better for the public interest, if the Department had raised your salary and then given you this work to do?—I understood that that would be done. The way in which I took the matter is this: I was doing a whole lot of work, very arduous itself, and there was a great deal of it. The whole of the North-West scrip issued since we commenced to issue scrip—nine-tenths of that has been drawn with my pen, and that in addition to my own work. Moreover, I have some knowledge of French and as a good many of these names were in French I had a good deal of writing and work to do in that direction. The fact of the matter is that the money that was paid in the name of Joseph Wright has been earned twice over.

141. We are not disputing that at all, Mr. Turner. I do not wish to put you in any false position or do you any injury, I am simply making enquiries in the public interest. There is no desire to hurt your feelings. Can you remember whether you ever consulted your superior officers with regard to using the name of Joseph Wright?—At that time the gentleman whose name I mentioned, Mr. Douglas, certified my accounts.

142. Who certifies your accounts now?—Since the scrip ceased, there have been none. I have received none of this extra work for the past 15 or 13 months. I have never received a dollar extra since then.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant) :

143. You endorsed Joseph Wright's name after his death?—No, sir; I do not know that he is dead.

144. You said he was?—I said I believed he was; I had heard a report that he was dead.

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

145. Do I understand you to say that this Joseph Wright had no existence at all?—Oh yes; at one time. I believe he may have now.

146. What relationship did he bear to you?—He was a distant connection of my wife's.

147. Did he do this work for you and you receive the money?—I did the work, and I received the money.

148. And used his name?—And used his name.

149. And subsequently after he left this country, you signed the name of Joseph Wright?—Oh yes, but I think only once.

150. You say he left this country about a year and a half ago?—About 15 months ago. I won't say exactly.

151. But Joseph Wright did not do any of this work?—Not any.

152. And the work was done by yourself?—I won't say that.

153. Who did the balance?—The late balance.

154. During the last five years?—I did it myself.

By the Chairman :

155. Did your second wife do any work?—She did some checking. After I had done the work she read it over with me for the purpose of checking.

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

156. But practically speaking Mr. Joseph Wright, as a person doing this work had no existence at all. You used his name?—Yes.

By Mr. Foster :

157. Did you sign Joseph Wright's name to these cheques?—Certainly.

158. And with his consent?—And with his consent.

159. Although you have no written power of attorney?—No.

By Mr. Hyman :

160. How did you come to get that consent?—He simply gave it to me.

161. But you had no power of attorney from him?—No.

By Mr. Somerville :

162. When he went to the old country, did he give you permission to use his name?—Not particularly.

163. But you used his name?—Certainly.

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

164. Who was Joseph Wright; what was his business or calling?—He was a school teacher, over in the States.

165. Was he not residing here?—No. He came to see us once or twice.

By Mr. Hyman :

166. What suggested to you to use Joseph Wright's name?—My first wife died. She had been a school teacher and was doing practically the most of this work.

By Mr. McMullen :

167. Was her name Wright before she was married?—No.

168. Did you use her name in putting in her accounts?—I did.

169. In what year?—At the very beginning. You will see her name probably in the Auditor General's Report—Mrs. Emma Turner.

170. That would be 1884 or 1885?—Yes; about then.

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

171. During the whole of this five years you say Wright visited you only two or three times?—Yes.

172. And during the whole of this time, Wright's name has figured on the backs of these cheques?—No; because there have been no cheques issued for the last fifteen months. You have to take that period off.

173. You commenced using Joseph Wright's name about five years ago?—Yes. I was told it was used for five years, but it is not over four; it is only three years and a-half.

By Mr. Wood (Westmoreland) :

175. What bank are those cheques drawn on?—The Bank of Montreal.

175. To bearer or order?—To order.

176. Did you draw this money personally?—I drew it personally.

177. Did the bank know you?—I do not know. They always paid the cheques; they always paid my salary cheque too.

178. Will the bank pay cheques here that any person presents?—I do not know. The cheques may not have been given me at the same time.

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

179. Could you give us Mr. Joseph Wright's present address?—I think so.

180. What is it?—3 Victoria Terrace, Lightcliff, near Halifax, Yorkshire, England.

By Mr. Somerville :

181. I understood you to say he was dead?—I said he might be. If he is not you will hear from him at that address.

(At this point Mr. Burgess pointed out to the Committee an entry in the Auditor General's Report of payment made to Mrs. Emma Turner for extra work.)

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

182. (To witness) Are you aware of any other parties in the Department who have been drawing money in the same way in other people's names?—Not that I know of, sir. Not that I know of of my own knowledge. I do not think there are any.

By Mr. McMullen :

183. You say that your chief in the Department suggested to you the way, or at least acquiesced or was cognizant of the fact that you were drawing money in this way?—Not my chief; it was Mr. Douglas.

184. What was his suggestion?—As I said my wife died. At that time I was in a great deal of trouble. I had done the work, and I wanted the money. My wife was dead and this name was taken.

185. Who suggested the name?—Mr. Douglas.

186. But he did not suggest this particular name?—He said some name must be taken.

By Mr. Somerville:

187. Who certified to the work after it was done?—Mr. Douglas.

188. But since Mr. Douglas' death?—Different parties.

189. Who were they?—The accounts themselves will show.

Mr. BURGESS—(interposing) It would principally be the Chief Clerk in the Patent Office.

WITNESS—They were certified by different clerks who were in a position to know that the work had been done.

By Mr. Somerville:

190. Who has charge of these accounts that were certified?—The Auditor General.

191. Has he the accounts?—Why, certainly.

By Mr. McMullen:

192. Was any other person cognizant of the payments being made to you in addition to Mr. Douglas in the Department?—I am not sure. I do not know. I am perfectly certain I never told anybody. If they were aware they got to know in some other way.

By Mr. Somerville:

193. Did Mr. Burgess know?

Mr. BURGESS—Not at the time.

194. Mr. SOMERVILLE—How long is it since you found this out?

Mr. BURGESS—I could not definitely say. It is not more than 3 or 4 months ago; comparatively recently at any rate.

By Mr. McMullen:

195. Were you aware of it before the service closed in the name of Wright?

Mr. BURGESS—No. At least I do not think I was.

196. Mr. McMULLEN—The person who certified to the accounts must have been aware of it?

Mr. BURGESS—I could not say that. That would not follow. There was a great deal of our work being done outside the office.

197. Mr. McMULLEN—But the man certifying to the correctness of an account in the name of Mr. Wright must have been cognizant when certifying to that account—must have known who did the work?

Mr. BURGESS—I do not think he would know it. He had simply to compare the account with the work done; that was all.

By Mr. Bowell (to Mr. Turner):

198. Did Mr. Douglas give you any reason for the course that he suggested when you substituted the name of Wright for that of your wife? I understand that your wife did the work, and in that case it was quite proper that the account should go in her name?—My wife died.

199. Did Mr. Douglas give you any reason why you should substitute somebody else's name instead of hers? Did he say to you that you could not draw the money in your own name under the Civil Service Act, and consequently it is necess-

ary to substitute some other name, or did you not think anything of it?—Really, to tell you the truth, I did not think much about it. I had not been at that time very long in the Department, and I thought it was to obviate jealous feelings in a great measure—that if people saw I was getting more pay than they were—people who had been in the Department for a longer time than I had—it would cause jealousy.

200. Did you know it was contrary to the Statute to draw extra pay in this way over and above your salary?—No; I thought it was in this way: Here was certain special work to be done—

201. That is not what I want to know. Did you know personally whether it was contrary to the provisions of the Civil Service Act to draw money other than your salary for extra work?—I did not know that.

By Mr. McMullen:

202. It was during the lifetime of your first wife that this business commenced?—Yes.

203. How long were you married the second time?—About a year elapsed after the death of my first wife. I had little children and I married again.

204. After you got married again you still continued to draw the extra pay in the name of Wright?—Certainly.

205. Why did you not adopt the principle of drawing the money in your second wife's name? She would be there then to sign the cheques?—That is true, but still it would make a great deal of bother in changing the accounts. The reason I did not do it was to avoid trouble. The fact of the matter is, I never troubled my mind about it.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant):

206. Why did you cease drawing it in the name of your wife?—My wife died.

207. But apparently, after you supposed this man Joseph Wright had died, you went on to use his name?—I said I heard that he was dead; I do not know that he is dead.

By the Chairman:

208. What time did you understand that this Mr. Wright died?—I think it is about a year ago, or something like that, that I heard he was dead. I am not certain that I received any cheque at all after I heard he was dead. If I did, it was only one.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant):

209. Did you get your cheques cashed at the same bank—your own salary cheque and the one in Wright's name?—Yes, sir; both.

210. Did they make any inquiry when you drew the money for Wright?—No; certainly not.

211. Though they knew you to be Mr. Turner, they never made any inquiry about Mr. Wright?—Certainly not. It is in this way: On a departmental pay-day—anyone can substantiate what I am going to say who knows anything of the way the Departments are run, on a departmental pay-day it is like a pay-day at any large establishment. You have to go to the teller's wicket at the bank in single file. The teller pays out the money as fast as he can pay it. Among the hundreds, I might say the thousands that are there I do not think he would take much notice as to who the man was who presented the cheque, provided the cheque was properly signed.

By Mr. McGregor:

212. But your cheques were not issued on the same day?—No; but if they had been I would have presented them on the same day. It would not have made any matter.

By Mr. McMullen :

213. Who is Secretary of the Interior Department?—Mr. J. R. Hall.
 214. Was he aware of the cheques passing in this way?—I do not know, sir.
 215. You do not know whether Mr. Hall was aware of the fact that the money was drawn in Wright's name or not?—I do not know anything about that. When the work was done it would be checked and passed and, the account certified by somebody, and then the account would be sent down for approval to the Deputy Minister or Secretary, as the case might be. When it came back to the Accountant he would look at it, and if he saw that it had been certified by a permanent officer, and approved of by Mr. Burgess, or Mr. Hall, or the acting Deputy, whoever he might be, then he would issue a cheque for the amount.

By Mr. Taylor :

216. In addition to the payments of your wife and those in Wright's name, did I understand you to say that you had rendered more service than the value you received?—You understood me to say that in addition to that for which I was paid I put in 210 nights of work, for which I have never received a cent yet.

By Mr. McMullen :

217. Have you pocketed all the money you received for extra work?
 Mr. TAYLOR.—I do not think the word pocketing is the correct word to use.
 218. Mr. McMULLEN.—(To witness)—Well, did you receive all the money credited in these names for extra work?—I received the whole of it; indeed I earned it.

By Mr. Taylor :

219. You say you have done 210 nights of extra work, for which you have not received pay?—I do.
 220. For what reason have you not received pay for that?—In this way:—I had to get the books out. It was regular office work and I did it out of love for my office and in order to get the work completed. If anybody knew how Mr. Beddoe and I were rushed in doing the work they would say we ought to be paid for it.

By Mr. Somerville :

221. When did you do this extra work of 210 nights?—When I first came into the Department.
 222. When was that?—In 1883.
 223. How many hours do you say?—About 210 nights.
 224. You worked 210 nights extra in 1883?—I think so—in 1883 and 1884. Altogether there were 210 nights that I came back again and worked.
 225. You worked in 1883 and 1884?—Yes and since;
 226. Have you a book with the names of the days marked down?—I have.
 227. Have you kept track of them?—I have.
 228. Did you state to your superior officer that you thought you should be paid for this extra work?—I did in this way: I mentioned that I had done a good deal of extra work, and I thought I might reasonably expect promotion. I thought it would be a good backing.
 229. What circumstance stood in the way of your promotion?—I was not at the head of my class.
 230. What salary do you receive now?—\$950.

By the Chairman :

231. What salary did you receive in 1883?—\$600. I passed the examination with four optionals, and so started at \$600, instead of \$400.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant):

232. You did not make this change of name without conference, without the knowledge, consent and approval of your superior officer—it was known to him? It was known to Mr. Douglas that I used the name of Wright.

233. He was your superior officer?—My wife died, and I had to use some name because I wanted the money.

234. Mr. Douglas certified the account?—Yes.

235. Did any one else know?—Not to my knowledge.

By Mr. McMullen:

236. Were you ever questioned by any other person in regard to using the name of Wright?—I was about four or five months ago. I was going along the corridor, when a gentleman in the Audit Office met me with one of these accounts in his hands. He asked me: "Who is Joseph Wright?" I said: "I suppose the man who signed the cheque." That is all I said; I then walked on to my office.

237. Who was this officer whom you met in the corridor?—Mr. Macdonald.

238. Who is he?—He is a clerk in the Audit Office.

By Mr. Hyman:

239. Is that the first time you were spoken to?—He is the first and only man.

240. How long is that ago?—A few months ago.

Mrs. LEE called, sworn and examined:—

By Mr. Somerville:

241. What position do you hold in the Interior Department Mrs. Lee?—I am chief in charge of the ladies branch of copyists.

242. What are your duties?—To superintend the attendance book and the general work in the office; to see that each lady performs the work given to her in the best possible manner.

243. You give the work out?—Sometimes, but I am speaking now of the ladies in the office. I superintend their work in every particular.

244. When the work is sent in to you, you receive the work that is required to be done?—Yes; I receive it.

246. And you allot it to the different clerks under you?—Yes.

247. And keep a record of the amount of work they do?—In one way I keep a record of all the work done, but not of each individual lady. That is not necessary.

248. Do you not have a file of the work each employé does?—No; not in regard to that. Each employé is supposed to be at work the day long. A record of the work that has gone through my office is kept and in that way we have a record of the work done.

249. Do you know Miss E. Bell—is she in your Department?—No. The ladies employed under me are in this book.

250. Do they all work by the day?—All those whose names are in the attendance book.

251. Have you in charge any of those whose names are not in the attendance book?—We used to give a good deal of work outside, particularly two or three years ago. Those that were employed outside, those who are not regularly employed, are not recorded in the attendance book.

252. But when they were employed outside you kept a record of the folios?—Certainly. We kept a record of the files that passed through the office.

253. How long is it since you ceased to give work out?—Since the 1st of July last.

254. There was some work done previous to June, 1890, under that head?—Yes.

255. You have the superintendence of this attendance book?—Yes.

256. You witnessed the signatures?—I initialled the book each day, showing that it is a correct list.

257. Have you had a Miss Agnes Duhamel in your branch?—Yes; I have had her for some years.

258. How long is it since she ceased to work for you?—Since August. I think she left in August or September, the year before last, but the book will show.

259. Do you know Miss Duhamel's signature?—Certainly.

260. Did you see her write her name here?—Certainly.

261. Is that Miss Duhamel's signature (pointing to book)?—That is her signature.

262. You are positive?—Perfectly positive.

263. Is that Miss Duhamel's signature (pointing to book)?—That is her signature, to the best of my knowledge and belief.

264. The second signature is not like the first one I showed you?—I could not say. A good deal depends on the pen. Is that a cheque you have there?

265. Yes?—I do not see them sign the cheques. I should say this is her signature, to the best of my knowledge and belief.

266. But you are positive that Miss Duhamel was performing work in your Department up to the date the book shows?—Up to the date the book shows.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant):

267. The lady said August last, a year ago?—I am not positive, but the book will show.

By Mr. Somerville:

268. I see by reference to the attendance book that the 2nd of August, 1889, seems to be the last occasion on which she has signed?—I am perfectly positive, as I told you, about her signature.

269. My information is not correct then, that Miss Duhamel has not been at the Department?—I should say so.

270. I have been informed that she is in Paris, France?—So she is. I have had letters from her.

271. When had you letters from her last?—About six months ago.

272. When did she go to Paris?—I understood she was going to Paris when she left here.

273. Do you know Mrs. Forrest?—I know Mrs. Forrest.

274. Is she one of the staff?—She was one of the outside staff.

275. Had you the superintending of her work?—Certainly.

276. She does not sign any book?—No.

277. She does extra work, that is, work given out and paid by the folio?—She is paid by the day. She works outside, but is paid by the day.

278. How do you know she works?—Because she returns the work to me. She is under my supervision, or was up to the 1st July. She received the work from me and returned it to me.

279. How did you keep track of the work she did?—By keeping the record.

280. Do you know by the amount of work she does?—Certainly I did.

281. I would ask you to send over to the Department for Mrs. Forrest's work?—I do not know how you can get that. I can only give you the number of files that she did.

282. You say she has been working steadily?—No. There are some days she did not work, because we had not anything for her.

283. How much did she work?—The average amount.

284. She worked regularly last year?—I do not say that. She did not work every day, but on the average.

285. I see that she was paid for 365 days?—That is the way, I suppose, they are all paid.

286. You are perfectly positive she has worked?—I am perfectly positive she has worked.

By Mr. Sproule :

287. Does the Department pay for the working hours in the day or only the 24 hours?—Really I do not know. The regular hours in the office are from half-past 9 until 4.

By Mr. Bowell :

288. You would consider that a regular day's work?—Certainly. I would count a day from half-past 9 in the morning until 4 in the afternoon of the same day.

By Mr. Sproule :

289. If a person did twice as much work in a day as they were ordinarily required to do, by putting in more time, would you count that as so much more work?—She would get what she considered a day's work—sometimes more, sometimes less.

290. But if she put in 365 days—that would be including the Sundays, and she is not supposed to work on Sundays?—No.

291. But might she not put in the ordinary office hours, from 9.30 to 4—that is six and a half hours—and then put in more by extra work in the 24 hours?—I suppose she might, but she never got any extra work.

By Mr. Bowell :

292. That principle of allowing clerks to put in two days within the 24 hours has never been recognized?—No.

By Mr. Sproule :

293. Do you pay for Sundays?—Certainly.

By Mr. Somerville :

294. When you get a piece of copying to do, and hand it out to a certain lady, do you not keep a record of that?—Certainly, of the file, but not of the number of the page.

295. Well, could you not give us Miss Duhamel's work?—It is impossible for me to give you the work of any particular lady in the office. I divide the work out amongst them, but I do not keep any record of that which they write in the office, because they work each day, and they are working all the time. It would take a great deal of time to hunt up each file each lady has done.

296. You have a means of ascertaining?—Of course, I know myself whether a lady has done her proper day's work.

297. Do you not keep a record of the work done, say by Miss Jones or Miss Smith?—When I receive papers to be copied I divide these out amongst the ladies in my office to the best of my judgment, and when the work is done I have a record as to where it was sent to be compared, but not the work each individual lady has done in the office.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant) :

298. I understand you give out a certain amount of work to the ladies, and do not take any account of it, beyond this, that you are satisfied in your own mind that they have each done a fair day's work; but in a large amount of copying you keep a record of that?—Decidedly.

299. Did Mrs. Forrest work inside or outside?—She worked inside for some time, but her health would not permit her to continue. She got a doctor's certificate, and therefore she was given work outside.

By Mr. Somerville:

300. When Mrs. Forrest got the work, did she go for it herself to the Department or send for it?—She usually sent for it; sometimes she came.

301. You checked the work?—Certainly.

302. You know the number of folios?—Not the folios; the number of the files.

303. I want to get the number of files handed out to Mrs. Forrest during the last year?—That would not show the amount of her work, but it might give a fair idea. Of course, there might be a great many enclosures.

304. Do you know a Miss Jane Hay?—No.

305. Is she in your branch at all?—No.

306. You do not know her at all?—No.

307. Do you know her, Mr. Burgess?—Mr. BURGESS.—Oh, yes.

308. Mr. SOMERVILLE.—What is she doing?—Mr. BURGESS.—She is doing general copying for the Department.

309. Under whose supervision?—She is outside the service. She is like a great many more who have been employed outside.

310. (To Mrs. Lee)—Did you ever have a cheque made out in your name for which you did not get the money yourself?—Not that I know of. I always get my own cheque and receive the money.

311. Do you remember having a cheque made out in your name for services rendered, the amount of which you did not receive yourself?—I do not.

312. You do not remember?—I do not remember anything of the kind.

313. Did not you get an extra allowance last year?—That was for working on returns. I got the cheque for that, and the money, too.

314. I see, according to the Auditor General's Report, that you were paid 184 days at \$2 per day, and 181 days at \$2.50?—That was calculated at so much per hour. It was considered extra work beyond my regular duties.

315. When was that work performed?—Before and after hours.

By Mr. McMullen:

316. How long have you been in the service, Mrs. Lee?—More than nine years.

317. And you have been continuously in the service since you commenced?—

Yes:

K. J. HENRY called, sworn and examined.—

By Mr. Somerville:

318. What branch of the public service are you in?—I am in the Secretary's Branch of the Interior Department.

319. What is the nature of your duties?—I am styled the Registrar of correspondence—that is, I open all the letters coming to the Department, all telegrams, and see that they are recorded and indexed, and sent round to the different branches for action. On their return, after action has been taken on them, I see that they are filed away properly.

320. You have something to do with the certifying of accounts?—I have, sir; quite a few.

321. To whose accounts do you certify?—To those in my sub-branch.

322. You do not certify to any accounts in the copyists staff, do you?—Oh, no.

323. What branch do you certify the accounts in?—Registration—the sub-branch.

324. Do you know a man named James A. Hickey?—I do, sir. I do not know whether his name is James or John, but I think it is John.

325. Did you ever certify to any accounts for Mr. Hickey?—I think I did.

326. I see that last year he was paid for 276 hours at 50 cents an hour, amounting to \$138. Do you remember certifying to those cheques?—I cannot say that I remember. I certified to accounts, but whether to that amount in his name I do not know.

327. Do you remember certifying to any accounts for extra work?—Oh, yes, I certified to accounts all along.

328. For Mr. Hickey?—Yes, for Mr. Hickey. I won't swear that I did, but the accounts will show. That is my recollection.

329. Did you ever certify an account in the name of an extra clerk, and was it within your knowledge that that extra clerk did not draw the whole amount of the money?—I did, sir.

330. Who for?—Mr. Humphreys.

331. Where is he now?—In Winnipeg.

332. In the service of the Department?—He is in the office of the Commissioner of Dominion Lands.

333. When was he sent out there?—Quite recently; since this trouble of the Lowe matter.

334. What was the amount of the cheque you certified?—\$200.

335. To Mr. Humphreys?—Yes.

336. For extra work?—Yes.

337. How much did he get?—\$100.

338. Where did the other go?—I understood it went to Mr. Chisholm.

339. How did he come to get it?—He got it as he stated for Mr. Burgess. At that time he was private secretary to Mr. Burgess.

340. When you certified to this account, did you know that the services had been performed?—It was in this way. I was coming in from luncheon about 2 o'clock that afternoon, and I knew that Mr. Humphreys had been wanting to get an additional cheque as a sort of remuneration. He was getting \$1.50 per day, and the deputy had allowed him to get an extra 50 cents a day or something like that. He was to get it in this way about every five or six months to prevent others in the Department being dissatisfied. I looked upon Humphreys as being a better man than many in the Department who, if they knew, he was getting this additional sum would probably bring political influence in order that they might also get it. I had no hesitation in doing it, although I said at the time I did not think it was right. But I was anxious that he should get some additional remuneration. I was coming into the office about 2 o'clock in the afternoon, when I met Mr. Burgess. I think it was in 1887. He was leaving for the North-West the next day and he said to me—he met me on the top of the stairs—"Henry, if you make out that cheque in favour of Mr. Humphreys and add an additional \$100, I will approve of it." I had issued one or two before that for Humphreys for the same sum, although I think on every occasion I said it would be much better to give him an additional 50 cents a day and I would bear the brunt of it rather than to do this. Mr. Burgess was in a hurry, and, of course, I did not want to stop him, knowing he was anxious to get away to the North-West. I did as I was requested, but it occurred to me at the time—who is this additional hundred dollars for? I thought I had a perfect right to know this. I had every confidence in Mr. Burgess and no doubt he will tell me. Mr. Burgess, however, went away to the North-West the next day, and I did not see him for a long time afterwards. The next day, Mr. Chisholm, his private secretary, came to me and said: Have you not got \$100 for the deputy? No, I said. He said, You must have. Humphreys has the \$100, and you had better see him. Humphreys had not got the cheque at that time, and I think the next day, when he had got the cheque and Chisholm had been to him two or three times for it. At all events he could not get it. Chisholm thereupon wrote Humphreys a note. This is what made me feel anxious, and I have felt ever since that the only wrong thing I ever did. I cannot remember the words of Chisholm's note to Humphreys, but I saw it, and it ran something like this—My dear Humphreys—You have got a cheque for \$200, the other hundred is for the Deputy Minister. I want it to pay his debts.

341. Who wrote this, do you say?—Mr. Chisholm. He was then Mr. Burgess's Private Secretary.

By Mr. Foster :

342. Whose debts was it to pay?—Mr. Burgess'. I said to Humphreys : this is a queer thing, what are we to do about it? He said, I will hold the note, and I told him he had better do so. When Mr. Burgess returns from the North-West, doubtless he will be able to explain it.

343. Well, Mr. Burgess returned in due course, but he was very sick at the time and was laid up weeks afterwards, if I remember rightly.

MR. BURGESS—You are mistaken.

MR. HENRY—I cannot say positively, but I think that was it. At any rate I felt I was in an awkward position, and I felt, moreover, that I should have an explanation. Possibly I would have had that explanation sooner, if it had not been for my friend Mr. Goodeve—I suppose you will be having him here—

344. Who is Mr. Goodeve?—He is Chief Clerk of the Patents Branch?

345. What is his first name?—W. M. Mr. Goodeve is a friend of mine; we have known each other since 1872, and we have been together almost daily in the office and out of the office. I confided the matter to him and I said such and such a thing has happened. He said "Oh by-the-bye I heard of it before you spoke to me," and I said I did not know it was common talk in the Department. He told me I had better hold on, but after awhile I felt it was my duty to see Mr. Burgess and to have an explanation. I saw Mr. Burgess, told him my case and stated what had happened. Mr. Burgess then gave me the explanation. At first we were alone, but I said to him that I would like Mr. Humphreys and Mr. Chisholm to be present to hear what he had to say. He thereupon sent for Mr. Chisholm, Mr. Humphreys and Mr. Hall was brought in to listen.

346. What is Mr. Hall's name?—John R. Hall. He is secretary of the Department. He was brought in to hear what Mr. Burgess had to say. Mr. Burgess' explanation, so far as I can remember, was that this \$100 that he got was for his late father-in-law for work that he did, I think, in connection with the report of the Forestry Commission, Mr. J. M. Morgan. It was particular work and his late father-in-law, Mr. Anderson, read the proofs, I think that was it, he compared and read the proofs, and he, Mr. Burgess, thought Mr. Anderson was entitled to this sum of the money, and that he hesitated about saying anything to the Minister or putting in an account for it, Mr. Anderson being his father-in-law, that he took this method of paying him. He said he had advanced his father-in-law the money out of his own pocket, whether by cheque or bills I do not now remember, and this is the way he took to get it back again.

347. When was this work performed?—I think before Mr. White's death.

By the Chairman :

348. Who were present when the explanation was made?—Mr. Hall, Mr. Humphreys, Mr. Chisholm, and Mr. Goodeve.

349. Did Mr. Humphreys give Mr. Chisholm this \$100?—I understood so, but I did not see him.

By Mr. Somerville :

350. You say this was done back of 1887?—Do you mean comparing the Forestry Report?

351. Yes? I really cannot tell you. You have that report here in the House. It was printed in the Departmental Report.

352. You felt you had done something wrong?—I did, and I feel it to-day. I feel I ought to be censured; I have always felt that.

353. Do you know of any other cheques having been issued on that account?—No, sir, that is the only one.

354. Are you aware of any cheques having been paid to permanent clerks in the names of extra clerks?—Yes, there have been moneys paid to permanent men on my own staff.

355. To whom?—They were all working together and the cheque would be drawn in the name of the extra men.

356. And the extra men did not get the money?—They divided up the money. If an extra man and a permanent man worked together, they divided up the money.

357. Supposing Smith and Jones were working together, Smith was the permanent man and Jones were the extra man, Jones would have the cheque made out in his name?—Yes.

358. Well, did he do the work?—Both would do the work; the extra clerk and the permanent one.

359. And the cheque would be drawn in the extra clerk's name?—Yes.

360. And he would divide with the other man?—Yes.

361. Why was it done?—Because the work had to be done.

362. How long has this practice been going on?—It was going on in Mr. White's time; in 1885 and 1886.

363. Is it a common practice?—Certainly; I do not think it is going on now. It was stopped last spring.

364. How do they get the extra money now?—I do not know.

365. You do not know of any other plan having been adopted?—Not that I know of.

By Mr. Foster :

366. You say this has been done in several cases?—As regards my own branch, I will give you the names of my staff, every man of whom, with the exception of myself, having participated in this.

367. Give us the names?—J. A. Coté.

368. He is a permanent clerk?—Yes.

369. Who was his partner?—The accounts will show that.

By the Chairman :

370. How will the accounts show that, when the names do not appear in the account?—That is true; I had not thought of that. I had a little time-book that I kept.

By Mr. Foster :

371. Was it a private book?—No. The clerks got about \$9 a week each, that is, two would go on this week, two the next, and so on through the batch. It would be seven or eight weeks before the first two came on again, unless in the meantime someone got sick and his place had to be filled by another.

By Mr. Hyman :

372. Do you know of any instances in which permanent clerks have done extra work during office hours, and received extra pay for it?—I cannot say that I do.

373. It has always been done after hours?—To my knowledge. Of course there may be cases, but I do not know of any.

By Mr. Somerville :

374. I suppose everybody in the Department knows the law?—I do not plead ignorance of it.

375. You knew that the way these men were being paid was illegal?—I did, and I said so time and again to Mr. Hall and Mr. Burgess.

376. What did they say?—What could you say? Here they were getting extra pay all through the Department. A clerk would come to me and say: "I am a married man on only \$500 or \$550, with a family to support, and I do not see why I should not get extra pay as well as other permanent officials." I had no hesitation, however, in telling them it was wrong.

377. You knew the work was being done?—Yes, I knew it.

378. When you certified to the accounts, you certified to it in the name of the man who did the work?—In the name of one of the men.

379. And he shared it up?—Yes.

380. Do you know James A. Hickey?—I know John A. Hickey.

381. I see he is down for 376 hours overtime and got \$735.50 altogether? Did you certify to his accounts?—I dare say I did, but the accounts themselves will show that.

382. Do you know if he got the whole of that?—Sometimes the extra men would apparently have too much for one month, and it might therefore be run over into the next month.

383. You did not want him to get more than \$9 per week?—I wanted to restrict them to \$9 per week.

384. And this extra besides?—And this extra besides. Hickey would put in an account in his name for that.

By Mr. Foster :

385. You knew that?—I knew that.

By Mr. Somerville :

386. Did your superior officers know about this?—I think not.

By Mr. Hyman :

387. Did you not have conversations with them?—No.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant) :

388. Were the salaries of these clerks only \$9 per week?—Oh, no. They had \$1.50 a day or \$45 per month.

389. That was the regular salary?—Yes. And in addition I did not want the men to go beyond \$9 per week for extra work to give each man a chance. There were 18 men altogether, and if you did not restrict them, some of them would get more than their share.

By Mr. Somerville :

390. What is your salary?—\$1,800.

391. Did you get any of this extra money?—I never took any.

392. And you knew all the time you were doing this you were doing what was wrong?—I did, Sir.

393. How many years has this been going on?—A good many years.

394. Under whose administration was it started?—I think in Sir David Macpherson's time.

By Mr. Foster :

395. Have you any special reason for saying it was in Sir David Macpherson's time?—I have not; it may have been in Mr. Mackenzie's time.

By Mr. Taylor :

396. The money was well earned in every case?—Oh, yes.

397. And if it had not been paid in that way, you would have had to employ extra clerks?—I cannot say that. We were engaged on an index, condensing three years into one, in order to enable us to get at the papers readily. You, gentlemen, would come over to the department every day and want papers, and if they were not obtained within three or four minutes there was a row. I wanted a system established in order that we might get the papers readily.

By Mr. Foster :

398. It was necessary work?—Certainly. It was a valuable index and is not even finished to this day.

By Mr. Taylor :

399. The Department got full value for the money ?—Yes, full value.

400. And if these clerks had not been employed you would have had to employ experts ?—You would have had to wait.

By Mr. Somerville :

401. Could not this index have been prepared in office hours ?—No, I do not think it could, because the books are almost in constant use.

By Mr. Taylor :

402. And the regular staff were the best men to do it ?—Certainly.

By Mr. Somerville :

403. Did Humphreys get his money in the regular way ?—Oh, yes, with the exception of that which I have spoken of.

404. What about that cheque for \$200 ?—That was independent of extra work.

405. How did he come to get that ?—Because as I tell you, the deputy wanted to give him an additional 50 cents a day.

406. And if he had given him an additional 50 cents a day it would have been recorded in the Auditor General's Report ?—Yes, and he did not want to do that.

By Mr. Corby :

407. How is that \$200 entered ?—I suppose it is entered to B. H. Humphreys for extra work,

By the Chairman :

408. You stated this was done about 1887 ?—I think that was it, but the accounts will show.

By Mr. Taylor :

409. How long have you been in the service ?—Since the 24th May, 1871.

By Mr. Foster :

410. In this position ?—In pretty much the same position.

411. And why do you not know if this has been going on since 1871 up to the present time ?—You have me on my oath ; I cannot swear positively.

412. You say it has been going on during Mr. White's time, probably in Sir David Macpherson's time and it may have been going on in Mr. Mackenzie's time ?—It may have been.

413. Having been there all that time, cannot you say when it first came to your knowledge ?—I cannot exactly tell you that ; I cannot say when.

414. You could not come near the time ?—I am pretty sure it was going on as far back as Sir David Macpherson's time, and it may have been going on in Mr. Mackenzie's time.

By Mr. Somerville :

415. Can you state positively when this was commenced ? Was it in force last year ?—Oh, yes.

416. That was in 1890, well, was it in force in 1889 ?—I think so.

417. And in 1888 ?—I am only speaking about my own work. Sometimes the index would stop for a few months.

418. But during the year 1888 ?—I think so.

419. Was it in operation in 1887 ?—I think so.

420. In 1886 ?—I think so.

421. You knew it, you say ?—I think so.

422. Well was it in operation in 1885 ?—I would not say whether it was or was not in 1885.

423. You would not go back of that?—I would not.

By Mr. Foster :

424. But you have no reason to think it was not?—It is very difficult for me to say.

By Mr. Somerville :

425. I understand the witness is positive as far as 1885?—No, I am not positive.

By Mr. Taylor :

426. By looking over the accounts for moneys paid, can you ascertain exactly when this practice was first in operation, whether in 1871 when you commenced, or what year after that. Have you any way of reaching that?—I got work in that way in the Finance Department in 1872.

By Mr. Foster :

427. For what work?—Counting notes.

428. That is the practice to-day? When did you go into the Interior Department?—In 1873.

429. Did you get any extra work in that Department?—I did; prior to the Civil Service Act going into effect.

By Mr. Somerville :

430. It would not be contrary to law before that Act passed?—No.

By Mr. Taylor :

431. Did you get any extra work in 1874?—I do not know that I did.

432. In 1875?—I cannot say.

433. You have no reason to believe you did not, over and above your salary?—I have no reason for believing, but I do not know that I did. In fact, I am almost certain I did not get anything.

434. Did any of the other clerks?—I do not know; I cannot speak for them.

435. You do not know whether they did or did not?—They may have done so.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant) :

436. Would it be contrary to law previous to 1882?—I do not think so.

437. But after that it was irregular?—Irregular and illegal.

Mr. BURGESS re-called, and further examined:—

By Mr. Sproule :

438. We have heard about information having been given, and rumours in circulation with reference to your Department. Do you know of any parties who gave any information, or whether these reports come from reliable sources or otherwise?

THE CHAIRMAN.—I think Mr. Burgess had better be sworn, seeing that we have adopted the principle of swearing witnesses since Mr. Burgess was first examined this morning.

Mr. BURGESS.—I am ready to take the oath and to swear to everything that I have said in my previous examination.

THE CHAIRMAN then administered the oath to the witness.

Mr. SPROULE repeated his question.

I do not know positively who gave the information. I may say, however, that about a month ago I received a message through the assistant secretary of the Department, from a Mr. Harry Palmer, who was an extra clerk in the Department of the Interior, to the effect that unless by the 20th June—this must have been before that, but I do not remember the date—unless by the 20th June I found a permanent situation for him in the public service, or employment for his daughter

in the Department of Indian Affairs, he (Palmer) was going to make disclosures concerning me.

By Mr. Somerville :

439. Was it a letter?—No; it was a verbal message. This was communicated to me by the assistant secretary of the Department. I told him I wanted him to put the message in writing, and he did so. It was to the effect that I have stated, that unless by the time mentioned this was done, he (Palmer) was going to make disclosures which would make it hot for me.

By Mr. McMullen :

440. Who was this man?—His name is Harry A. Palmer. He was taken into the Department several years ago, but being over 35 years of age, and not having passed the Civil Service Examination, under the decision of the Treasury Board, to which reference has been made this morning, he, along with others, had to leave the service.

By Mr. Hyman :

441. Where is he now?—That I do not know.

By Mr. Sproule :

442. How long is it since he left the Department?—He left it immediately after I got that message.

By Mr. Daly :

443. He was fired?—Yes; he left immediately I got that message.

By Mr. Foster :

444. Will you give an explanation of the circumstances connected with the \$200 cheque drawn up in favour of Mr. Humphreys?—In the first place, permit me to say that I never drew a dollar or a cent of money myself from the Government by way of extra remuneration from the day I entered the service up to the present moment, directly or indirectly. I remember the particular occasion mentioned by Mr. Henry. I was about to leave, as he says, for the North-West. The circumstances are pretty much as he has stated them, except that he has omitted to give the explanation I made to him when the cheque was drawn. The claim that was made on account of Mr. Humphreys I always understood to be for the reason that he worked after 4 o'clock.

445. The claim had been standing?—It had been standing, and, as Mr. Henry says, it had been arranged that he should be paid for that work.

By Mr. Somerville :

446. By whom had it been arranged?—With myself and the Minister of the Interior.

447. With Mr. Dewdney?—No; with Mr. White. He was an extra clerk and could have been paid any amount of money we choose to give out of the outside vote, but I did not want to break down the rule in the Department of paying more than \$1.50 a day. I quite agree with Mr. Henry that this man was entitled to additional remuneration; but I did not want to break down the rule of \$1.50 per day.

By the Chairman :

448. He was superior to the clerks in the Department?—He was. The day before I left for the North-West I said to Mr. Henry that I would let Humphreys' account pass for \$200; but it is also true, which Mr. Henry appears to have forgotten, that I explained to him what I intended to do with \$100 of it.

By Mr. Foster :

449. What was Humphreys' claim for \$100 or \$200?—It was really, I understand, for more than \$100. But if he had been given more than that he would have exceeded the 50 cents a day extra which it was proposed to give him in this way. I told Mr. Henry then, as I told him subsequently, but evidently he has forgotten it, that I intended this extra \$100 for Mr. Anderson. I do not see why Mr. Henry should have laid such stress on the fact that Mr. Anderson was my father-in-law. He was an old and accomplished journalist, and when the report was made on Forestry by Mr. J. M. Morgan, of Amherstburg, after reading it over I considered it was not in good literary form, and had to be revised by somebody. I therefore gave it to this old gentleman, who carefully went over it from beginning to end. He rewrote the whole of it, and afterwards revised the proofs. I thought he was entitled to something, but I had some delicacy about giving it to him directly, as Mr. Henry says, because he was my own father-in-law. That being the day before I was leaving for the North-West, and Mr. Anderson being in the act of changing his residence, it being the first of May, I put my hand in my own pocket and gave him \$100, and I said, that when Mr. Humphreys handed over the extra \$100 out of the \$200 to Mr. Chisholm, he could give it to me. I considered that I had a perfect right to recoup myself for that amount.

By Mr. Hyman :

450. You knew that in doing this you were doing something that was illegal?—No; I do not know that. Mr. Henry excuses himself for receiving money up to 1882, but in this case the work was performed, not by Mr. Humphreys, but by another man.

451. Would not the better way have been to have put Mr. Anderson's name in the ordinary way?—Doubtless.

452. You must have acknowledged that you were doing what was wrong?—I did not think it was wrong.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant) :

453. Did Mr. Henry see you subsequently to this interview?—No; I went off immediately to the North-West.

454. I do not mean then, but at any subsequent time?—Yes; a few months ago.

455. He wanted to ascertain the reason then, for the payment?—Yes. He had some cause then. I had had occasion to take objection to the size of his staff and the way he was running it, and the suggestion was made that if he were only to see the size of the staff in the Land Commissioner's Office at Winnipeg he would notice the difference. I may say, also, that some years ago I refused to recommend Mr. Henry's promotion.

By Mr. Hyman :

456. Was this previous to the receipt of the \$100?—I never received it. To Mr. Anderson, as I said.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant) :

457. At this interview at which the others were not present, did you tell Mr. Henry what was to be done with the money when you asked him to draw the cheque?—I think I did; I think that question was discussed then. Mr. Henry's impression was that I had not told him, and my impression is that I did.

458. So that the only discrepancy between you is that Mr. Henry states that you did not tell him at the time, while you think you did?—That is so.

By Mr. Corby :

459. If Mr. Henry did not think it was right, why did he not speak to you about it for such a long period afterwards?—That I do not know.

By Mr. Taylor :

460. When did you enter the service, Mr. Burgess?—In 1876.

461. Was it the practice in that year to pay the permanent staff to do extra work?—I so understand.

462. In 1876?—Yes.

463. And the practice has been continued more or less ever since?—Yes.

464. Where there was extra work to be done by the permanent staff?—Oh, no; I never understood that Mr. Henry's permanent clerks were getting any of this extra money. He did come to me and object to certain office accounts, but I never understood that was his objection.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant) :

465. What was his objection?—That was the end of it, as far as I know. He says every clerk in the office got some share of this extra money. If they did, I did not know it.

466. You knew the system was being carried on?—I knew the extra men were being paid.

467. And the system of sharing up with the permanent staff—you knew it?—I did not; positively I did not.

By Mr. Taylor :

468. But in 1876 permanent clerks were occasionally employed over-time and paid for it?—I know that some of the clerks of the Interior Department were employed over-time in the Finance Department.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant) :

469. But anything before 1882 would not be irregular, so far as those payments were concerned?—I suppose not; on the mere ground of the law, there was no irregularity in paying those extra clerks.

By Mr. Foster :

470. What I understand you to say is, that you knew permanent men in your Department were receiving extra pay?—I did not. I thought that only the temporary men in the Department were receiving extra remuneration.

471. You knew the temporary men were receiving extra pay?—Yes.

472. And you did not know your permanent men were in partnership with the extra men, and were getting part of what these extra men were drawing?—I did not.

By Mr. Somerville :

473. Was Mr. Humphreys a permanent clerk?—No; he was an extra man. He is in Winnipeg now. If you were to call him here he could not tell you more than I have told you at the present moment. The reason he went to Winnipeg is this: The late Mr. White had arranged that he should be appointed permanently, but being a young-looking man, unfortunately I allowed him to attain his 35th year before the appointment was made. In fact, up to that time a vacancy had not presented itself. I represented his case, as I am doing now, to Mr. Dewdney, with a view to securing him a permanency, but meanwhile he is engaged in the Land Commissioner's Office at Winnipeg.

By Mr. Foster :

474. When did Mr. Anderson do the work you have mentioned?—In the fall of 1886 or the other part of 1887.

475. Did you arrange for him to be paid for it?—I did not make any arrangement with him.

By the Chairman :

476. What is your value of the work?—Certainly more than \$100.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant):

477. Why should there have been any delicacy about it?—I see now there should have been none. I suppose it was mistaken delicacy. He was the only relative I had in the country, and as something had been said in the newspapers about his getting employment in the Department, perhaps it was on that account.

By Mr. Hyman:

478. You paid the money out of your own pocket?—I paid him the morning I was going to the North-West.

479. And you got it back again?—My private secretary got it.

480. How long was it after the work was done in 1887?—It was immediately after the work was completed. It was work that took a considerable time; it was in the winter of 1886-87.

By Mr. McMullen:

481. The Minister knew the work was being done?—He did.

482. He was cognizant of the fact?—He was, but not of my giving the money to Mr. Anderson.

483. Practically, there is no certificate in the Department that he did the work?—Oh, yes. There is the pamphlet; it speaks for itself.

484. You made the Minister aware of the fact that Mr. Anderson did the work?—Most decidedly. I may say that the Minister was being pressed to publish this Forestry pamphlet.

485. And the Department received full value for this \$100?—It received much more than value.

486. Then the only thing about this transaction is the simple irregularity in reference to the way it was being paid.

By Mr. Hyman:

487. Did the Minister know the money was being paid?—I arranged with the Minister that it should be paid, but he did not know the way it was paid.

By Mr. Bowell:

488. I understand you to say that to your knowledge no permanent clerk in your Department has received extra pay?—I say, with the exception of Mr. Turner who was here this morning, there has not.

By the Chairman:

489. You speak of the whole Department?—I do.

490. You do not know of any other?—No.

The Committee then adjourned.

COMMITTEE ROOM, TUESDAY, 14th July, 1891.

Committee met—Mr. WALLACE in the Chair.

FRANCIS McCABE called, sworn and examined:—

By Mr. Somerville:

491. In what part of the public service are you employed now?—I am at present employed on the Census staff of the Department of Agriculture.

492. At one time you had a position in the Interior Department?—Yes; I was employed there as temporary clerk in that Department for some time.

493. What was the nature of your duties; what work were you employed at?—I was part of the time comparing letters that were sent into the Department with

the original drafts; part of the time I was *précis*-writing, and I was for a time assisting in settling up the claims of the volunteers who served in the North-West Rebellion of 1885. I was some time at that. I was for quite a while employed in comparing official documents in the Department.

494. That was your particular duty?—For a part of the time; not all the time.

495. I see, according to the Auditor General's Report, page 33-B, you were paid for 365 days at \$1.50 a day, and extra work 102 hours, at 50 cents. That would be \$51 you got for extra work. Do you remember that?—Which year, please?

496. The fiscal year ending 30th June, 1890?—I remember doing extra work; I do not remember just now what it was.

497. Here is one of your accounts. Will you take a look at it. Is that your writing?—Yes.

498. Here is another account—is that your writing?—Yes.

499. The whole of it? Yes.

500. Is the bottom line yours, too?—Yes.

501. And the whole account is in your handwriting?—Yes.

502. What is the date of the first one?—27th January, 1890.

503. What is the date of the next one?—27th February, 1890.

504. And you identify these two accounts as having been made out by you?—I identify the handwriting in the body of the account, but I notice a certain correction made in the date which I do not remember having made myself.

505. Were you instructed to make that account out yourself, or did you do it of your own option?—Will you permit me to give an explanation?

506. Certainly, we want to get at the truth, and you can make whatever explanation you please.

507. Who certified to those two accounts as being correct?—Mr. F. Nelson.

508. Who is he?—He is a clerk in the Department of the Interior.

509. Is he one of the principal clerks?—He is a second-class clerk.

510. Can you explain about this account?—About this date—27th January, 1890—as well as I remember, I was employed in the Department working under Mr. J. S. Brough. I was, I think, as well as I can remember, allowed some extra work at that time. I know I was allowed extra work.

511. I want you to be particular about that, and to be specific as to what you were allowed?—At that date or during this winter—the winter of 1890—and for sometime previous, to the best of my knowledge, I was drawing some extra pay. I was a temporary clerk in the Department, and I am willing to refer the case to my chief as to whether I earned that money or not.

512. That is not the question?—I think I earned whatever money I drew for myself as an extra clerk.

By the Chairman:

513. What was the work you were doing?—At that time, as far as I can remember, I was doing *précis*-writing.

By Mr. Somerville:

514. What I want to get at is, what were the services rendered for that account?—So far as I remember about the account certified to by Mr. Nelson, he at that time, to the best of my knowledge, was away from his regular work engaged in preparing, or assisting to prepare, the annual report of the Department. That is what I think, and he had helping him at that time, to some extent, Mr. Palmer. Either he or Mr. Palmer, I cannot just remember which, came to me and said they had a great deal of extra work to put in in connection with that report; that they worked after hours and they were entitled to extra pay for it; and they asked me—

515. Who asked you?—One of them; I don't remember which.

516. Try and remember?—I cannot distinctly remember.

517. Can you not come to a conclusion as to who it was?—To the best of my recollection I think it was Mr. Palmer. I am not quite certain.

518. What occurred then?—It was stated to me on that occasion that this extra work had been done—

519. By Palmer and Nelson?—Yes; and that it was felt that extra pay was merited. I was then asked to allow my name to be used in that connection, without any consideration at all—that I was not to receive any part of the money.

520. You were not to receive any of the money?—No; not any part of it, but to oblige them by letting them use my name in the matter. After considering the matter, and enquiring into the amount of work done and the character of the work, I concluded to give them the use of my name. I did not wish to get any of the money myself. It was not given with that intention. It was merely an accommodation.

521. This Nelson is a permanent clerk?—Yes.

522. About the other account, was it got up in the same way—the account dated 27th February in the same year?—I only have to tell you that I do not remember of Mr. Kinloch ever having certified to an account of mine. I do not remember ever having asked that gentleman to certify to an account for me.

523. When you say that, do you imply that some other officer took it there?—I do not know.

524. This first account was made out by you at the dictation of Palmer or Nelson. You were not know what they were entitled to?—After telling their case to me I enquired into the amount of work and the character of the work and I thought at that time that whatever money they would get would be got honestly—that they were honestly entitled to. As a matter of accommodation I allowed my name to be used.

525. You could not know what amount of work they had done?—I enquired.

526. From them?—Yes; as far as I remember.

527. It was by the information you received from them, and at their dictation, you made up this account?—If I remember correctly, they showed me the work they had.

528. It was at their dictation you made the account?—I do not remember the details at all. I know this much: the account would never have been made out unless they had asked me to do so.

529. Is the other account in the same position?—I do not remember to this moment Mr. Kinloch ever certifying to an account for me.

530. Was it under similar circumstances? Who requested you to make out that second account?—I do not remember.

531. Did you do any work for that account, or was it done by Palmer and Nelson?—I do not know.

532. Did you do it?—All I wish to state is this, that at this time of the year I was working after hours in the Department. It was decided I should receive extra pay for the extra work that I did.

By Mr. Hyman :

533. Who decided?—I was told by Mr. Hall, Secretary of the Department, some time previous to this date. During this time I was receiving extra pay.

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

534. Do you not remember whether in that month you received a sum of money equivalent to that account?—I do not remember the amount I received each month.

By Mr. Somerville :

535. It is a simple matter to say if you remember distinctly how you came to make that out. Did you do the work for that account?—If you will allow me, I will continue my statement, which is all I have to say to you.

536. I am asking you with regard to this account, and not with regard to your extra pay in the Department. What I want to get at is this first: Was that account made out for work done by yourself, or work done by other men, or by another man?—I was about to tell you that I do not remember this particular account. The

work which I was doing at this time, with the exception of this first account, was, as well as I can remember, certified to by Mr. Brough, and this is the first intimation I have received of Mr. Kinloch's name being put to an account of mine.

537. The certificate has nothing to do with the work. You certainly remember if you did the work?—I was telling you that at this time I was offered extra work. When I was doing this work I handed every account to Mr. Brough, to the best of my knowledge. This first account is one that I told you was certified to by Mr. Nelson, but all the rest, with the exception of the one I thought was certified to by Mr. Nelson, was certified to by Mr. Brough. I was working under Mr. Brough at that time. I did not expect to meet this kind of certificate by Mr. Kinloch.

538. Here is the cheque for the first account—\$24.50. You got that cheque, I suppose?—I see it is made out in my name. Yes; I endorsed that.

539. Do you remember drawing that money out of the bank?—I do not remember having drawn it.

540. Did you get that money?—That is the one certified to by Mr. Nelson. I gave the money to Mr. Nelson or Mr. Palmer. I gave it to both of them.

541. Did you get any portion of it?—Not that I remember, not from Mr. Nelson.

542. Did you get any portion of that money?—Not of the account I put in. I do not think, as far as the account I put in.

543. Who did you hand the cheque to after it was given to you?—I do not remember; I cannot remember just now.

544. Do you remember that after the cheque was made out you handed it to a certain man in the Department, and he took it to the bank and got it cashed?—I do not remember at all. I do not remember whether I got it cashed or he.

545. Did you not get \$5 out of that amount?—Of which amount?

546. That first cheque.—To the one certified to by Mr. Nelson?

547. Yes.—I do not remember having got it. I remember getting \$5 at that time from Mr. Palmer. I always thought in consideration of extra work that I did for him. I think that was the intention; I do not know what his intention was—but I took it as that.

548. That he paid you for work you had done for him?—He was aware that I did the work, and I took it as the regard for that. I did not take it as an incitement to preparing the account.

549. Was there any remark made when Mr. Palmer paid you that?—No; I do not remember any.

550. What portion of the second cheque did you get?—The one certified to by Mr. Kinloch?

551. Yes.—I do not remember that account at all.

552. Did you get any portion of that?—No, sir; I am sure I did not, because I do not remember the account.

553. Did you not get \$4 for it?—I do not remember it.

554. Do you remember getting a cheque in the previous year, or cheques, for \$254 for work done?—Excuse me. About that \$5, I remember some money being given me. I know it was a small amount, and I think it was \$5. But this \$4 I do not remember anything about at all.

555. You remember you said you were working in connection with Mr. Brough. You remember getting a cheque for extra work in 1888-89, and how much of that did you hand over to Mr. Brough as his share?—What month?

556. I cannot tell the month. You remember getting a cheque that year for extra work?—Yes; I remember that. I remember doing extra work and getting extra pay.

557. Did you share your extra pay with Mr. Brough?—Part of the time I did.

558. How much did you give him of the amount? I am informed you got \$254 for extra work in 1889 and shared it with Mr. Brough.—Yes.

559. How much did you give of it to Mr. Brough?—I do not remember, but I would like to explain the matter briefly.

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

560. Can't you tell us generally? Did you give him half?—While we worked together I did, I think. I was working with Mr. Brough before his name was mentioned in this connection of extra pay, and I felt I worked very well for it and received it honestly and legally. Some time during that winter Mr. Brough came to me and stated that I was to work with him. There was then, I think, returns for the House of Commons being prepared, which was in addition to the usual work I was doing. I continued to do this extra work which I had been previously doing, and joined in with Mr. Brough in doing this other work. Mr. Brough and I worked together after hours, sometimes in the morning, as far as I can remember, before nine o'clock. We worked very hard, and the account we made out in my name because I was an extra clerk; but I divided the money with Mr. Brough.

561. Because you were an extra clerk?—Mr. Brough was a permanent clerk and I was an extra, and they were made out in my name.

562. You knew Mr. Brough was not entitled to receive any?—I felt he was honestly entitled to receive it.

563. Did you not know it was contrary to the Civil Service Act?—I felt it was not strictly in accordance with the Act.

By Mr. Somerville :

564. Who instructed you to do this?—Mr. Brough himself.

565. Did you receive instructions from anybody else?—Not directly.

566. Had you any instructions indirectly?—No. Mr. Brough told me he was to work with me.

567. You, to the best of your recollection, gave Mr. Brough about half the amount you received for extra work in 1889?—Yes; I do not remember whether we exactly divided, but whatever Mr. Brough and I got I felt we were very honestly entitled to it.

568. Was Mr. Brough the party who certified to the account?—I handed the accounts to Mr. Brough because I was working under him; but I do not remember whether he certified to them or not.

By Mr. Hyman :

569. Who was the person who should have certified to the account?—Mr. Brough.

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

570. I understood you to say in your previous evidence that Mr. Brough had certified to your accounts?—Before Mr. Brough came into the matter at all he certified.

571. Did he certify to this particular account that you divided with him?—I handed them to him; but I do not remember seeing his initials or certificate attached. I suppose the account will show.

572. It was his custom to certify?—Yes.

By Mr. Somerville :

573. You came to this understanding to share up this extra money because it was the usual practice in the Department. You knew it was in practice there by other clerks. It was a common practice there?—I was informed it was.

574. Who informed you?—I remember having heard it stated. I do not know whether the practice prevailed to any great extent, but I understood it did. Mr. Brough spoke to me about working with him.

575. Can you give me some information about this account of 27th February, 1890? Because, I may tell you that I have another witness who knows all about that account, and you might just as well tell about it now?—I assure you I am trying to cloak nothing. If I cannot answer this question to your satisfaction it is because

I do not know it. May be if my memory is refreshed I may get along better. I am sure you cannot show I did anything wrongly.

576. But you did not get this money at all?—The only way in which I can remember Mr. Kinloch's name being mentioned is that Mr. Palmer told me that an account I put in in connection with work done by Mr. Nelson was taken in to Mr. Hall by Mr. Nelson and Mr. Kinloch. I see that these dates do not correspond—that is, the date certified to by Mr. Nelson and by Mr. Kinloch. One is the 27th of January and the other is the 27th of February.

577. Can you recollect how that came about?—Really I cannot. I do not remember Mr. Kinloch ever having certified to an account, and I don't remember ever having asked him to do it.

578. Do you remember in 1886 giving a clerk in the Departments the use of your name for an account amounting to \$73.50 under similar circumstances to these?—If you will excuse me for a moment, I would say that as far as this account of Mr. Kinloch's is concerned I should be glad if any explanation could be given that would refresh my memory upon the subject. If this could be done I would be quite willing and happy. I don't remember at this moment that Mr. Kinloch ever certified to that account.

579. Well, in 1886 do you remember allowing your name to be used for an account amounting to \$73.50?—Can you tell me the month, please?

580. I cannot. I have not the papers here; we have only the papers for last year?—I remember allowing my name to be used for some account. I think it was \$73.50.

581. I asked you if you allowed the use of your name for that account?—Well, at that time I was working—

582. Now, this is a simple question; answer it directly. Who asked you for the use of your name?—I think it was Mr. Nelson.

583. The same man who asked you for the use of your name in the other case?—I don't say whether in that other case it was Mr. Nelson or Mr. Palmer.

584. He asked you for the use of your name for this \$73 account in 1886 and you gave it to him?—He drew my attention to the fact that there was a certain amount of extra pay for work done partly by me and partly by himself. He said "that extra pay was deserved for the work that was done," and that he knew the amount of extra hours charged for were put in, and I was asked to allow my name to be entered as extra clerk. I never received a dollar of that money. I did it because I felt the money was honestly earned—probably not legally earned—but I felt the money was earned, because I understood Mr. Nelson had put in extra time. I put in extra time myself, but I did not keep an account because I was not looking for extra work.

585. How much of that \$73 did you get?—I don't remember ever getting any of it.

586. Then it all went to Nelson?—To the best of my recollection it did. I was not looking for any, and don't remember ever having got any. I felt when I allowed the amount to go in my name that the money was well earned. It was for extra hours put in partly by Mr. Nelson and partly by myself. I don't know how many I put in. I put in some, and he put in a great many, or at least I understood so.

By Mr. Foster :

587. Did you say you did part of the work?—I worked extra time, but I was not looking for extra pay.

588. You did not get extra pay?—No more than the use of my name. I did not get any.

By Mr. Somerville :

589. You said Mr. Nelson kept the whole of this \$73.50?—Yes.

By Mr. Lister :

590. How long has this sort of thing been going on, in so far as you were concerned—for how many years past?—The extra pay, you mean?
591. Yes; the permanent clerks being paid in this way for extra work?—Of course, I am only aware of those two gentlemen I spoke of.
592. I am only asking you to speak so far as your knowledge extends?—This case—
593. Never mind this case. How long has this been going on? You have only given two or three cases.—This case was the first I had anything to do with.
594. That was in 1886?—Yes.
595. But you had something in 1887?—For whom?
596. I don't care for whom—for Palmer or Nelson?—Yes; for Mr. Nelson in 1887, I think it was. I remember working on an index of Orders in Council relating to the Department of the Interior. I put in extra time at it, and I felt whatever money we got was well earned.
597. I am not doubting that?—We got money, and I think to the best of my recollection it was given in my name.
598. How much was that?—I do not remember; it was not a very large amount. I think I received about \$10.
599. How much did Mr. Nelson receive?—I don't know. It was probably a little more. My account was very small.
600. That was in 1887?—Yes; I think it was. That is the only instance in 1887 that I think of now.
601. You swear it is the only one?—To the best of my recollection, it was the only one.
602. In 1888 the same thing took place. An account was made to you and a cheque was made to you?—I don't remember, sir.
603. Do you swear you don't remember whether in 1888 extra work was paid for in that way?—I never knew that I would have to give this evidence until lately.
604. That is only two years ago?—Yes; I think I commenced to get extra pay in 1888.
605. Who was the gentleman over you—Mr. Nelson?—I think in 1888 I was working for Mr. Brough.
606. Did you "divvy" up with him?—In this particular case I spoke of I have already said he and I worked together.
607. That was in 1889?—I don't remember if I "divvied up" in 1888.
608. Just try and put your thinking-cap on and refresh your memory?—Of course, I am free to admit what "divvying" I did with Mr. Brough; it was in 1889.
609. You say he did work for you, and you did work too, and you divided upon the cheque?—Yes.
610. Did you do that in 1888?—I don't remember whether it was in 1888 or 1889.
611. But you had extra work every year, had you not, since 1886?—I only got extra work myself, I think, in 1888 and in 1889.
612. But your chief, Mr. Nelson, did extra work every year, did he not?—Mr. Nelson did work in 1886 and 1887. We did a little extra work on the index of Orders in Council.
613. Well, in 1888 then, I understand you to say, you cannot swear whether there was any money paid, in the way of a cheque being given to you for extra work done by Mr. Nelson?—I don't remember, sir.
614. You do remember in 1889, and you do remember in 1890?—Which instance is that, sir?
615. Well, did you have extra work in 1889?—I remember doing work in 1889. I was working under Mr. Brough.
616. And you and he were working together?—Part of the time.
617. And the cheque was made out in your name?—Yes.

618. And you gave him a share of the money?—Part of the time I did.
619. What portion of the year would that be?—I think it was during the session.
620. During the time Mr. Brough and you were working together, doing extra work, cheques were made out in your own name?—Yes.
621. And the cheques were divided?—Yes.
622. He getting a portion and you a portion?—Yes.
623. Who got the lion's share?—I think it was equally divided.
624. Did not Mr. Brough get the most of it?—I think it was pretty well divided.
625. What is your judgment? Did Brough get the most of it, or did you get the most?—On the whole, I don't think I got the most.
626. Who was your immediate chief in 1889—Mr. Brough?—Yes.
627. Then there was an arrangement made between you and Mr. Brough that Mr. Brough should have extra work, and you should have extra work, and that the cheques should be made out to you. That was the agreement, was it not?—That is what I understood it to be.
628. Was there not an expressed agreement?—I don't remember. I have an impression the cheques were made out in my own name.
629. You want the committee to understand there was no conversation?—I don't remember any conversation. Brough told me we were to work together, and I understood the cheques were to be made out in my name. I was the extra clerk and he was not.
630. He was your chief?—Yes.
631. You have told us you enquired into this extra work considerably to satisfy yourself that Mr. Brough had done his share of the work?—No; with Mr. Nelson. I knew what Brough was doing.
632. You enquired into Nelson's case, to see he was not getting more than he was entitled to?—I enquired into the amount of work done.
633. Who did you speak to about that?—I think to him and to Mr. Palmer.
634. Did you speak to Palmer?—I don't remember more than I had a conversation with Mr. Nelson upon the subject, and I asked about the amount of work and the kind of work that was done.
635. You said you enquired into the work, and considered it was fair to allow the use of your name to Palmer and Nelson?—I considered the work was well earned.
636. You investigated the work that was done?—Yes; I enquired about it.
637. Who did you enquire from?—I think I went up to the room and asked.
638. Asked whom?—I think I spoke to Mr. Nelson and to Mr. Palmer.
639. You thought it was your duty to investigate what your superiors had done, and to see whether they were doing too much or too little?—They were not my immediate superiors in that case.
640. Well, they were your co-conspirators?—I don't think I was a conspirator, Mr. Lister.
641. Well, put it as you like. You thought it was necessary to investigate the work they did?—I don't know that I thought it necessary. I enquired into it.
642. And from the enquiries you made, you satisfied yourself that the charges that they were making were right?—The charges for money, you mean?
643. For extra work?—Yes; I considered at the time.
644. Who investigated your account, because you had a share? You put in for work, too?—When?
645. Did you or did you not get a share, or did this money go to them? Did all that money go to them?—In that connection?
646. There was a cheque made out, we will say, for \$800, half to go to you and half to the chief, Palmer or Nelson or Mr. Brough. Now, your work had to be supervised by some body; who did that for you?—I was working under Mr. Brough. Mr. Brough supervised it.
647. Mr. Brough supervised your work and you supervised Mr. Brough's work?—I think so.

648. Of course he was over you?—He is my chief—yes.
649. He certified to the work you did and you investigated the work he did?—We worked together.
650. You told us you investigated?—You are mixing the two names together.
651. Well, we will call it Nelson. Did Nelson certify to your work?—Which work—the work done by me when I was under Mr. Brough?
652. When you were under Mr. Nelson. Were you ever under Mr. Nelson?—I was under Mr. Nelson, when I left the Department last fall.
653. And you and Mr. Nelson had a little charge of this kind, and Mr. Nelson certified to your work. Yes or no?—I understood he did.
654. You know he did. And did you investigate Mr. Nelson's work?—I was not called upon.
655. You told me for the purpose of satisfying yourself the money was fairly earned you made enquiries?—That is the time Mr. Nelson and Mr. Palmer drew extra money. I enquired into the amount of work they did.
656. You had nothing to do with Palmer and Nelson. They came to you as a stranger?—Not as a stranger. I was very well acquainted with them.
657. And asked you to allow them to use your name?—Yes.
658. You were working under Mr. Nelson on 27th January, 1890, were you not?—I think I was working under Mr. Brough then.
659. And that account for Mr. Nelson, was it not in January, 1889, for \$24.50?—I think so.
660. Is that your handwriting?—Yes.
661. Well that work was for Mr. Nelson?—That was the account.
662. And you made out the account in your own name and Mr. Nelson certified it as correct?—It appears so.
663. That is so, is it not?—It appears so.
664. Well, was there any part of that for Mr. Nelson's services or was it all for his services?—I don't remember having done any work of that character.
665. That was all for Nelson. He got the \$24.50?—Yes.

By Mr. Devlin :

666. Did you not do a great deal of that work for which pay has been given?—Which work, sir?
667. The extra work?—I have done a great deal of extra work in the Department.
668. With regard to those cheques, do you think that Mr. Nelson or Mr. Palmer would have complained had you kept the full amount of the money, or would they have been satisfied that you had done the work meriting those cheques?—I don't remember, Mr. Devlin, more than that I was working after four and after six in the evening, but I don't remember the circumstances of the case at all.
669. And when you allowed your name to be used by Mr. Nelson you did not think you were doing anything wrong?—No; I did not think I was doing a dishonest thing, by any means. I enquired into the work they did and found they did enough work to merit the money.
670. You were induced to do that by Mr. Nelson?—Either he or Mr. Palmer spoke to me. I had a conversation with both before it went through.
671. If you had kept the money for which the cheques were made your conscience would not have reproved you—you would have felt satisfied you had done the work?—I felt satisfied I was doing enough extra work at the time.

By Mr. Somerville :

672. You have already stated in your evidence that you did not work for this. you just allowed the use of your name to Mr. Nelson for that amount?—Yes.
673. You did not do any work for this?—It was extra work under another chief.
674. You did not do any extra work for this amount; it was Mr. Nelson?—My recollection is, I simply lent my name.

675. You simply lent your name to Mr. Nelson?—To either him or Mr. Palmer,

By Mr. McMullen:

676. When did you enter the service?—In 1885.

677. As temporary clerk?—Yes.

678. Who obtained the position for you?—I got the position through Mr. Macmaster, who was then member of Parliament for Glengarry.

679. And you have been in the service since 1885?—I think my appointment that year was only for the session; I left when the session was over, and shortly I was reinstated in the Department, and remained there until last autumn, when I resigned and went to Toronto to study medicine.

680. When did you return?—I returned this spring, and received employment on the Census staff.

By Mr. Denison:

681. You are an extra clerk now then?—Yes. If the Committee wish any more evidence from me I shall be most willing to give it. I would like to say this before leaving: Any money I received from the Department of the Interior I felt that I honestly earned it, and I think the gentlemen who were my chiefs will swear to that—that I legally and honestly earned it.

By Mr. Lister:

682. Were you receiving any money while you were studying in Toronto?—Any pay while I was there?

683. Yes?—When I left the Department, as far as I can remember, I had not taken my regular holidays. I applied for my holidays just when I was leaving, because I had not taken my holidays during the year, which was customary for the clerks to take, and for the first month I received a cheque.

684. That was all?—Yes.

HARRY PALMER called, sworn and examined:—

By Mr. Somerville:

685. How long have you been working in the Interior Department?—Seven years next November. I was doing outside work for about six months before I went into the inside service.

686. What branch were you in?—First of all I was in charge of 30 or 35 women—outside copyists; I counted all their work, and made out their accounts on the 15th of every month. The accounts then went to Mr. Hall, the Secretary of the Department, when I had initialled them and certified to them.

687. To come down to business, look at this account, dated January 27th, 1890. Did you ever see that account before?—Yes, sir.

688. Where did you see it?—Mr. Nelson had charge of getting up the Annual Report for the Interior Department, and he called upon me to assist him. I had been on that work for three or four years previous. Mr. Parsons and I one year got it up together, but I received no extra pay for it. When Mr. Nelson and Mr. Parsons had charge of the work they got \$100 for it; Mr. Parsons got \$50 and Mr. Nelson got \$50.

689. How did the parties get that money?—Mr. Nelson did not do any of the work; he simply had the supervising of it. I did the work after my usual day's work. I would often commence work again after supper, at half-past six or seven, and work until eleven or half-past. At the end of the month Nelson came to me and said, "I guess you are entitled to extra pay for this work." I said to him, "All right, how much am I entitled to?" and he said, "\$24 or \$25." I thought half a loaf was better than none at all and I said, "I have got a family to support and I would sooner take half of it than nothing at all." I said I had put in a great many

more hours than what he proposed to pay me for, and he said to me, "Yes, I know you have."

690. You were not a permanent clerk?—No, sir; an extra clerk.

691. And you were, therefore, entitled to draw pay for extra services?—Yes. After I made up the account he certified to it and he said, "I would like to get some too; do you think you could fix it with McCabe." I said, "McCabe is a pretty good fellow, and I think he would have no objection." He said, "I done it some years ago, and I do not see why he should not do it." I may say that McCabe is one of the most faithful and hard-working officers we had in the Department.

692. I notice that you certify to each other's character?

WITNESS.—No, not particularly; but I will say this: he was a hard-working man and never left the office at four o'clock as the others did. Well, I saw McCabe and at first he refused to do what Nelson wanted. He said, "I am damned if I will do it." He said, "Nelson did not treat me right when I came downstairs." I said, "If you don't do it I will lose my share," and then he said, "If it is to help you I will do it; if you are going to lose yours I will do it;" so he done it. I accordingly brought up the account and Mr. Nelson certified to it.

693. Were you present when this account was made out?—Yes; he made it out in my presence and I took the account to Nelson. I was there while he made it out.

694. What was the understanding, that it was for services rendered by McCabe or Nelson?—By Nelson.

By Mr. Foster:

695. And yourself?—No, sir. My own account ought to be there also for \$24.50. We got even amounts. Well, I brought the account up to Mr. Nelson and he took it to Mr. Burgess and it was certified to by Mr. Burgess. When Mr. Nelson came upstairs again he stated to me, "I did not like to approach Mr. Burgess in this matter with this account, but I told him you had refused to accept any money because it is I who got it." I said, "You told him a damned lie, Mr. Nelson."

696. Did Nelson do any of this work?—Yes; some of it. I went to his house and worked for four hours on two consecutive Sabbaths. That is all the work Nelson did.

697. That is how that account originated?—Mr. Nelson took the account in to Mr. Beddoe and then got the cheque. I presume Mr. Beddoe sent the cheque to Mr. Burgess and it was signed by him. Mr. Nelson handed me the cheque and told me to go to the bank and draw the money. I thereupon took the cheque to McCabe and he endorsed it. When I came up again I said that McCabe had to get something out of this, for the use of his name, and I got \$5 out of the account and handed it to McCabe.

698. Who told you to hand that to McCabe?—Mr. Nelson; it was for the use of his name.

699. Now about the next account, dated February 27th, 1890. Did you see that made out?—I did.

700. Tell us the circumstances.—Mr. Nelson said: "I do not want to present this account to Mr. Burgess on account of getting the other one." He said: "Could not you fix it and get Mr. Hall to certify it?" I said: "No, I won't go near Mr. Hall, nor ask him for any such thing." He said I was a great personal friend of Mr. Kinloch, "Could you not get Mr. Kinloch to present it to Mr. Hall. If he does it is all right." Mr. Kinloch refused point-blank at first to do it. However, he re-considered the matter and said, "I will take it in to Mr. Hall." He did, and Mr. Hall certified to it, and that is the end of that. When he got that cheque Mr. Nelson told me to get it cashed, and I got that cheque cashed also.

By Sir Richard Cartwright:

701. Read that (pointing to the account).

"Certified correct.—H. KINLOCH.

"Approved.—J. R. H."

702. I thought you said that Kinloch refused to certify to it?—He did at first, but he afterwards reconsidered his decision. Well, I got the cheque cashed and came back, and Nelson said, "I suppose \$4 will be enough for McCabe for this account." I said, "I do not know about that; this is your generosity; you can do as you like." Well, he gave me the money and I handed Mr. McCabe the \$4.

703. What did you say to McCabe when you gave him the \$4?—I said: "Mr. Nelson sends you this—"

704. What for? For the use of his name?—Yes; the same as he got \$5 for the first one

Mr. McCABE (interrupting)—I do not remember that.

Mr. PALMER—Your memory is pretty short. You remembered it well enough a few days ago.

By Colonel Denison:

705. Are you in the Department now?—No, sir.

By Mr. Foster:

706. Will you explain clearly why this second account was not taken to Mr. Burgess?—I do not know, except that Mr. Nelson did not want it to go to Mr. Burgess.

707. He gave you no reason?—No, sir.

By Mr. Bowell:

708. But surely he must have assigned some reason. Was it in his own name that it was presented to Mr. Burgess?—He gave me no more particular reason than this. He said: "I do not want to trouble him with a second account." He was working on the annual report with Mr. Ogden, ex-M.P. There was a second cheque for \$95 of which he was to receive half for that, and so he was really paid twice over. If he received \$47.50 from Mr. Ogden, he would get this other for doing nothing.

By Mr. Somerville:

709. And this work if it was done, was done during office hours?—My work was done after hours, and he supervised it in office hours.

710. And he did not do any work for this?—Except on the two Sabbaths, when we worked four or five hours each.

By Mr. Lister:

711. Will you make this Ogden matter clear?—Well, the men who get up the annual report are always entitled to \$100 for the work.

712. And you say that for this amount nothing was done?—No, I say that I worked at this altogether with Nelson. Ogden was sick at the time, and when he got better the report was nearly all done.

By Mr. Somerville:

713. You state that this man Nelson did no work for this first account dated January 27th, 1890, except in office hours?—Yes, with the exception of the two Sabbaths in which I went to his house. We worked for about four or five hours. I took the galleys.

714. Oh, you were reading proof. Who held the copy?—I held the copy.

715. And you worked four hours each Sunday?—It might be four, five or six. We started at ten in the morning and I did not come away until half-past three or four in the afternoon.

716. You were kept continuously at work?—Oh, yes.

717. But there was no work done for this at all?—Except during office hours.

By Mr. Adams :

718. When did you leave the Department?—On the 8th June.

719. What was the reason you left the Department?—That would be a long story.

720. Give it shortly.—It is a long story.

721. Can you tell why you left the Department on the 8th of June?—On the 6th of June I met Mr. Pereira, the Assistant Secretary, at about a quarter to six, at the corner of the Union House. I was going down to my tea. I asked Mr. Pereira for an interview and when he could give me one. He said: "With pleasure." I said: "Where will I meet you; will you come to my house or come to the hotel and meet me at the Russell?" He said: "Anywhere you say," and he asked at what time. I said: "Any time this evening," and he said he would meet me at the summer house. I met him at half-past seven and then commenced to tell him about the ugly rumours that were being circulated about our Department. I told him about this case of Joseph Wright, Mr. A. Berry and numerous other cases which I presume will come up afterwards. He stayed with me until about ten minutes before the death of Sir John. I asked him to lay these facts before Mr. Burgess and to tell him that the dismissal of twelve or fourteen of us extra clerks would have an ugly effect.

By Mr. Foster :

722. On whom?—On our party.

723. Which party?—The Conservative party.

724. Do you belong to that party?—Yes, sir, I do. I never became a renegade for any office. I never put pen to paper—

By Mr. Somerville :

725. Go ahead with your story.—I laid all these facts before him and I said: "You know what I am." I told Mr. Pereira: "Now," I said, "you know very well that I had a partial promise to have my daughter put in the Indian Department. To prove that I am disinterested, you promise that you will do all you can—she is a first-class typewriter, as the Messrs. Holland Brothers will certify—if you will do that, and it is done by the 20th, I will step down and look for a job somewhere else. If you will do that, I will step down and out of the Department; but I would like to have sufficient bread and butter, as I might not be able to get a job in Ottawa and leave my family here." I supposed we could get along on that for a year, with what my wife has. We have a couple of Senators with us during the Session. I merely stated I would step down and out of the Department if he would do that, and I would like an answer by the 20th. Whatever facts he laid before Mr. Burgess, I do not know. Would you like me to read Mr. Burgess' letter of dismissal?

By the Chairman :

726. When did this conversation take place with Mr. Pereira?—6th of June. This is the letter I received from Mr. Burgess:—

(EXHIBIT No. 1.)

"OTTAWA, 8th June, 1891.

"SIR,—Mr. L. C. Pereira has conveyed to me your message to the effect that unless by the 20th instant provision is made for continuing you in the employment of the Government, or a situation be found for your daughter in one of the public Departments, you propose to make some disclosures which, in your opinion, will reflect upon me and other officers of this Department in connection with its adminis-

tration. I have now to inform you that your services as a clerk in the Department of the Interior are dispensed with from this date.

"I am, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"A. M. BURGESS,

"Deputy of the Minister of the Interior.

"Mr. H. A. PALMER,

"Department of the Interior,

"Ottawa."

When I received this letter I went to Mr. Pereira and asked him if he would give me an interview with Mr. Burgess. He said: "It is no use; you had better see your friends." I said: "I will not beg; I will not ask my friends for nothing." However, Mr. Birkett volunteered, and said: "I will take Mr. John Graham up with me." They went up and asked Mr. Burgess if he would see me, and he said no, he did not want anything to do with me.

By Mr. Somerville:

727. Why did you want to leave the Department?—Because I thought if they provided for my daughter it would be sufficient.

728. I thought you said you were disgusted with the proceedings. Why were you so disgusted?—This thing has been hanging over our heads for the last two years.

729. What thing?—Our dismissal. Every three months or so we were told we would have to go. Two years ago, I think about April or June, they made up a list and it was approved by Mr. Dewdney, and there were thirty-two of the extra clerks on this list. I was told by a gentleman who saw the list.

By Mr. Montague:

730. Were not all the extra clerks on it?—All in our Department.

731. There was no discrimination?—I cannot speak about Mr. Deville's branch.

By the Chairman:

732. Have you passed the Civil Service examination?—No; I was over age.

By Mr. Montague:

733. You were not threatened with any dismissal except what the law provided?—No; but we did not want it applied to one Department. We were told every month or so: "You must go next June." That time would be tided over and then we were told "You will have to go in September." Then, we did not hear anything more about it until the 1st of January. "On the 1st of January you must go sure;" but we never received any notice at that time. It was just a dog's life. Every man will tell you the same as I have told you, that it was a constant irritation. Every month or we were told we would be fired. I got so disheartened that I said: "I will get out." I thought I was entitled to a position for my daughter. I think Mr. Mackintosh will bear me out that when he could not raise a corporal's guard for Sir John Macdonald that I marched at the head of seventy-five men and gave Sir John a reception.

By Mr. Adams:

734. Did you tell anyone but Mr. Pereira?—No; because I had the interests of the Department and the party at heart.

735. After you got this letter from the Deputy Minister on the 8th of June, did you then tell anyone about this?—No, sir; I did not. I never mentioned it to any person but Mr. Pereira up to the present time.

By Mr. Montague :

736. You say you wrote to somebody?—I enclosed a letter to the Minister of the Interior, enclosing a copy of Mr. Burgess' letter, which I have here.

By Mr. Adams :

737. Did you tell any person since receiving the letter of the 8th of June?—I have not, although Mr. Burgess accused me of being the man who gave this information. I have not.

By Mr. Somerville :

738. You spoke to Mr. Graham?—I never gave Mr. Graham any secrets.

739. But you told him about your being discharged—Yes.

By Mr. Adams :

740. Did you inform any person outside of Mr. Pereira as to the matters testified to here to-day?—No, sir, because I was well treated in the Department, both by Mr. Burgess and all the officials.

741. You say that Mr. Burgess wrongfully accused you?—Yes; it came out in the public evidence in the papers. It would not take a very small mind to know who accused me. Mr. Burgess had not the slightest occasion for that accusation.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant) :

742. You had told no one until you read that evidence?—No, sir; and then my hands were untied, and I did not hesitate. When Mr. Burgess accuses me I have a right to protect myself and family, and I will endeavour to do it.

By Mr. Bowell :

743. Were you not aware that the Auditor General had taken the position that those who had not passed the Civil Service examination could not remain on the pay-list?—We were told so, but I was informed the Auditor General denied that.

744. Who informed you?—It was spoken of around the Department. I cannot name them now, as it is a long time ago.

By the Chairman :

745. Did you receive a notice from the Interior Department some time ago that your services would be dispensed with?—Yes; along with fourteen or fifteen others. Here is the letter:—

(EXHIBIT No. 2.)

“ DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
“ OTTAWA, 28th April, 1891.

“ DEAR MR. PALMER,—I regret very much to be obliged to inform you that, under the provisions of the Civil Service Act, it will not be possible to retain you in this Department after the 30th day of June next.

“ Yours faithfully,

“ JOHN R. HALL,

“ Secretary.

“ HENRY PALMER,

“ Department of the Interior,

“ Ottawa.”

By Mr. Somerville :

746. You were dismissed then at that time with fifteen others?—No; I was dismissed on the 8th of June, because of this conversation which I held with Mr. Pereira.

747. Did any others go out at the same time?—No, sir.

748. Have any others gone out since?—I think two or three are out.

749. Are there any more than three out, then?—All were taken back. They went back on the following day, except Mr. Hickey, who remained out one day.

750. Is he back?—I may say that I simply expostulated.

By Mr. Taylor :

751. How do you know about Mr. Hickey?—I know he is back, and he was out for one day.

By Mr. Lister :

752. There is only one of the fifteen struck off?—There was Col. Bethune, Mr. York and I think a Miss Slater—beside myself. Mr. Pereira's brother drew up a list, and I suggested drawing up a memorial to Mr. Burgess.

By Mr. Montague :

753. When was that—previous to the time you had made the threat?—This was in May.

By Mr. Somerville :

754. The witness denied that he made a threat?—I said they would have to make up their minds. I said there was no use for a man who threatened to write the whole Department up.

By the Chairman :

755. Will you explain how the giving your daughter a position would prevent these disclosures?—I had nothing to do with that. They were made afterward. I never threatened to make any disclosures, and if Mr. Burgess says so he says what is false.

756. Why did you want your daughter to get employment?—Because I had worked hard for the party.

757. You said you would step down and out if your daughter got a position. That has, to my mind, rather a peculiar meaning under the circumstances?—I would not state it was those exact words; but I think I used these words.

758. But the Government were employing you?—That was a matter with Mr. Burgess. If he decided to retain me I did not want a position for my daughter.

759. Why was your daughter connected with it?—She has passed her examination and was promised a position in the Indian Department.

760. And if your daughter had got the position you would not be here to-day giving evidence?—I do not know whether I would or not.

761. What do you think?—I think possibly I would be here; because I find out that other men had made up their mind to make these disclosures.

By Mr. Denison :

762. What was the name of this old newspaper man?—The old newspaper man—I think he was—was Mr. Hickey.

763. He said he would show up the Department?—Yes; he said he would show them all up.

By Mr. Daly :

764. How do you know he was taken back?—Because I was told by half a dozen men. There is the gentleman himself over there in the corner.

FRANK NELSON called, sworn and examined:—

By Mr. Somerville :

765. You are an officer in the Interior Department?—I am

766. What position do you hold?—There is no official title to my position. I am a second-class clerk in the Secretary's branch of the Department.

767. What salary do you receive?—\$1,250 at present. I received \$700 when I entered first.
768. How long have you been in the Department?—Nearly nine years.
769. What business were you at before you went into the Department?—I was in a railway office in Chicago before I entered the Interior Department.
770. You are a man who received a very good education?—Yes; I am a B.A. from Toronto University. I had a pretty high standing there, too—a B.A. with honours.
771. You are conversant with the Civil Service Act?—I have seen the Civil Service Act, but I never studied it out. I do not suppose one in fifty has done so. I do not know that it is the business of an ordinary clerk to do so.
- 771a. You are sufficiently conversant with the Civil Service Act to know how you should conduct yourself in your own Department?—Yes.
772. You have read the Act, and know that no permanent clerk can receive pay unless it is voted by Parliament?—Yes.
773. When you entered the service of the Government—when you were appointed to office—you took an oath?—Not at first; but I think I did take the oath of office in the office of the Clerk of the Privy Council. I did not remember that. It was some time after entering the service. That is on record.
774. Would it be five years ago?—About that.
775. Just read that, and put in your name where the blanks are.
“I, Frank Nelson, solemnly and sincerely swear that I will faithfully and honestly fulfil the duties which devolve upon me as a clerk of the Interior Department, and that I will not ask or receive any sum of money, services, recompense or matter or thing whatsoever, directly or indirectly, in return for what I have done or may do in discharge of any of the duties of my said office, except my salary or what may be allowed me by law or by an order of the Governor in Council; so help me God.”
776. Well, that is the oath you took?—Yes.
777. You have been in the room, have you not, while the other witnesses were being examined?—I have been here some little time. Mr. McCabe was on the stand when I came in.
778. We will just refer you back to this account. Do you see this account here?—I see it is an account for 49 hours' extra work.
779. Well, give the date of it?—27th January, 1890, and certified to by F. Nelson. That is my signature.
780. That is for \$24.50?—Yes.
781. You heard the evidence given by Mr. McCabe with regard to that account?—I don't know that I did.
782. You heard the evidence given by Mr. Palmer?—Yes; and to say the least of it, I was greatly surprised indeed. I must say I am prepared to contradict Mr. Palmer on nearly every point with regard to this account.
783. Did you ask Mr. McCabe for the use of his name when that account was made out?—I did not speak to Mr. McCabe at all about it before that account was made out.
784. Who did you speak to about it?—I did not speak to any body about it.
785. How did it come to be made out?—At this time the “grippe,” I think, was prevalent, and the clerks of the Department were depleted; several in my office were away. There were several jobs on hand—the annual report, and I do not know whether it is confidential to say the North-West Territories Act,—and a large amount of work in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Judge Clark was here, I think, about that time.
786. A member; Selecting lands?—Yes; a large amount of work had to be done in connection with that matter. Mr. Burgess was short of hands—at least, he asked me if I could assist him in any way. I told Mr. Burgess I was short, and that I was working night and day with what I had on hand. I said with regard to this: “There is Mr. Palmer; he is not sick; I see him around; I will get him, and he will help me

out of the work." It was a work Mr. Palmer was conversant with. Mr. Palmer and I did considerable work. He says he was at my home two Sundays in succession. Perhaps that was true. I do not remember. I know that when I was engaged on the work I was stricken with "grippe" too, and Dr. H. B. Small ordered me to go home and go to bed for three days, or I would be very ill. I went home and went to bed. Dr. Small called to see me and I was sitting up in my bedroom in a dressing gown and working. He said this would not do, that I would have to go to bed and remain in bed. Mr. Palmer called shortly afterwards and we worked together. Most of that time we were working at my home I was in bed. I think Mr. Palmer will admit that when we got done with this work Mr. Palmer said to me: "Nelson, I will put in my account now." I had kept pretty faithful track of Mr. Palmer's work, and Mr. Palmer, if I rightly remember, wanted more than I would certify to. He said: "Nelson—

787. I only want to know about this account?

Several MEMBERS.—He is leading up to it.

Mr. Palmer said: "See here, I want to put in more than my own account." I said: "I know what you want to do, but I won't have anything to do with it." He said then something about speaking to Mr. McCabe. What it was I do not know, or what he intended to say. When Mr. Palmer laid his account before me this of Mr. McCabe's was with it. I said: "What is this?" He said: "Mac has been working over time, g— d— it, until 6 o'clock at night, and he has done that work." Well, I took the account along with Mr. Palmer's and put it into my pocket. I saw Mr. McCabe shortly afterwards, and I said: "Mr. McCabe, that matter of Palmer's is all right, is it not? You did the work?" He said something about working overtime, and working at night, and something or other about 48 hours' extra work. In this case I was led to ask, because the work is not specified here and I had not supervised it. I assured myself from enquiries of Mr. Palmer that the work was done and of Mr. McCabe, I spoke to him afterwards. He said he was working overtime, and I knew Mr. McCabe would not make an account out unless he thought he was justified. In matters of this kind, sometimes we have largely to depend upon the honour of the man who makes the account out. I cannot keep an account of work done when a man works at his own home, but I was always scrupulously careful to either inspect the work myself, or by carefully examining and carefully questioning to elicit from them information which satisfied me the work was done. I was satisfied Mr. McCabe did his work. Mr. Palmer said he handed me a cheque and I handed it to him. I never saw the cheque.

788. If Mr. McCabe stated he never did any of the work he is not telling the truth?—I—

789. Answer the question. If Mr. McCabe says he did not do any of the work he is not telling the truth?—For that particular account Mr. McCabe told me he worked overtime?

790. I want you to answer the question, sir. If Mr. McCabe swears he rendered no service for that account—that he did not work for it—you say then that he is not speaking the truth?—I did not say Mr. McCabe is not speaking the truth. I say Mr. McCabe told me at the time he was working overtime. I tell you, Mr. Somerville, we are not used to being pulled before a tribunal like this, as Mr. Palmer.

MR. PALMER.—You're a liar, sir, I never was before any tribunal.

Messrs. McCabe and Palmer were then ordered to leave the room.

By Mr. Somerville:

791. What I want is an answer to my question. I do not want to get you into any trouble, but I want to ask you this question: Mr. McCabe swears that he rendered no service for that account, that it was made out to accommodate you and at your request?—If he says at my request—

792. Wait a moment. He says that he rendered no service for that account, but that it was made out for the purpose of helping you?—At my request, you say? It was not at my request.

793. He did it either at the request of Mr. Palmer or Mr. Nelson?—Mr. McCabe said that? I did not speak to McCabe at all about this thing. The account is made out in a very unusual way. It says: "49 hours' extra work." I know Mr. Burgess enquired the date of the work, and what work was done. When I presented the account Mr. Burgess said: "What is this? I replied: "I enquired about the work, Mr. Burgess, and I am satisfied it is done," and he then approved of it.

794. What was the nature of the work?—It was writing actions on the back of files, assisting in preparing correspondence, and indexing books. It was more than the work of one man, and Mr. McCabe did that work under Mr. Brough and myself.

795. We have already in evidence Mr. McCabe's testimony to the effect that he did not do any work for that account?—I don't know that. Mr. McCabe satisfied me at the time that he did. His extra work I don't know, but he satisfied me at the time. I was scrupulously careful in certifying to any of their accounts. There is my certificate that the work was done. I was scrupulously careful to enquire and satisfy myself that the work was done before I put my name to.

A MEMBER.—Then you must have been satisfied by McCabe?—I was, and by Mr. Palmer. He said: "G—d— it, McCabe has worked until six o'clock every night, and he ought to get pay for it."

By Mr. Somerville:

796. For extra work on the 28th of January, 1890, there is a cheque for \$24.50, representing that account endorsed by McCabe?—Yes.

797. Did you ever have that cheque in your possession?—I never saw it before, unless amongst a bulk of papers. I never saw that cheque before.

798. Did you ever hand a cheque to Mr. Palmer to go to the bank to cash?—Never, unless one of my own salary cheques, and I always cashed them at the bank myself. I never handed a cheque to Mr. Palmer to go to the bank and cash. What connection would I have with it? How would that cheque come into my hands when the Accountant signs the cheque to the man himself?

799. You were in the room when Mr. Palmer gave his evidence?—I was in.
800. And you heard him swear that when this account was certified by you you gave him this cheque to go to the bank?—Yes; I heard him say so, and I did not give him that cheque. I never saw that cheque or Mr. Palmer's letter.

801. Did you not give Mr. Palmer \$5 to hand to Mr. McCabe for the use of his name?—I did not give Mr. Palmer \$5 to give to Mr. McCabe; that is a matter that I will swear that I have nothing to do with whatever.

802. Do you say on your oath that you never received any portion of the money from this cheque?—I will explain now.

803. I want you to answer that question?—I cannot say what money was drawn on that cheque.

804. There was \$24.50 drawn on it?—You asked me if I received any portion of it, and I was going to explain what did happen. You will notice another account here of Mr. Palmer's about the same time for almost the same amount. I think I would not certify to Mr. Palmer's account for \$40 as he wanted me to.

By Mr. Montague:

805. He asked for \$40?—Yes; for the time he was working for me I kept a record; I knew the work, and that was not work that he was calling for. He said there were some big errors for which he was entitled, and I replied: "I don't know anything of that; I will certify to the work you had with me." A few days after these accounts were made I found—I won't be sure of the sums—\$20 on my table and I surmised at once it had been placed there by Mr. Palmer. When I spoke to Mr. Palmer about it I said: "Here, did you do this?" He said: "Don't ask anything about it." I said: "See here, you know this won't do." I don't remember exactly the words that passed between us, but I said: "See here, this won't do; I have a regular salary as permanent clerk." Well, he said: "When a man works at home on Sunday in bed sick, if he is not entitled to a little extra money I don't

know who is." I said: "That is not the point at all," but I acknowledge that I received the money.

806. How much money?—I received about \$20. I am not sure whether it is that account, whether Mr. McCabe and Mr. Palmer took the two accounts and put them both together and divided them up. I don't know what they did; I only received the sum I mentioned.

By Mr. Somerville:

806a. My recollection of what Mr. McCabe said is that he never received any money at all?—He said he received \$50, I think, for Mr. Palmer. Whether that was the amount or not I don't know. Mr. Palmer did the financial part of the work. That money, Mr. Somerville, was forced upon me; it was laid on my desk. I know that I should not have taken it, but it was left there and it was forced upon me.

807. What portion of this account did you get—(account produced)?—"Certified correct"—I knew nothing about that account.

808. Did you get any portion of that?—I never remember of receiving anything. That is the account I think Mr. McCabe said he knew nothing about to Mr. Kinloch and Mr. Hall.

809. Well, then, you say distinctly that the statements made by Mr. Palmer and Mr. McCabe with reference to more accounts are not here?—I don't say that. I know some of these settlements made by Mr. Palmer are certainly not here; and I must state to you I have heard before I was brought up to be examined that somebody had a particular spite against me in this matter, and they were going to roast me; and it did not take very long when Mr. Palmer came up here to see the source of it. With regard to this account, I don't know. You are asking me now about an account that Mr. Kinloch certified to, and of which I know nothing.

810. Did you send Mr. Palmer to Mr. Kinloch to certify to that account?—I did not send Mr. Palmer to Mr. Kinloch; I knew nothing of it.

811. You knew nothing of it at all?—I knew nothing of that account.

812. Do you know this: Mr. Kinloch took that account to Mr. Hall. Is it not Mr. Hall's signature to it?—Yes.

813. After Mr. Kinloch took that account to Mr. Hall, and got it certified to, did you not go into Mr. Hall's office the next day, a short time afterwards, and meet Mr. Hall, and thank him for certifying that self-same account?—I don't remember having done so.

814. Well, now, try and remember that?—I don't remember.

815. Well, now, try and remember; because I am in possession of information that you did that in regard to the second account?—With regard to the second account, I have no recollection of that.

816. You swear you do not remember thanking Mr. Hall for his kindness in certifying to that account?—I don't remember.

By Mr. McMullen:

817. Will you swear you did not?—I may have done so; I am speaking now to the best of my recollection.

818. I am asking you will you swear you did not?—I will not swear I did not. A great many things pass through my hands, and Mr. Hall and the officers of the Department walk about a great many things that one time and another. All I can say is this account is entirely new to me, Mr. Hall may have spoken to me about this but I have no recollection.

By Mr. Somerville:

819. Why would Mr. Hall speak to you if your name is signed there?—I don't remember Mr. Hall having spoken to me about it.

820. And you don't remember having spoken to him?—No; I won't swear to the honourable gentleman that I did not; absolutely I swear that I have no recollection of speaking to Mr. Hall.

By Mr. Lister :

821. If such a thing did happen, why would you thank him?—I don't know.

822. You have no interest at all in the cheque or the money, and you have no knowledge of whether you thanked Mr. Hall?—I don't know.

By Mr. Somerville :

823. You know something about the system which has been prevailing in that Department for some time—that is, for extra clerks to do work and share up the money with permanent clerks?—Yes, you are right; I have known that system; at least, I have known it to prevail more or less.

824. For how long a time?—For four or five years, perhaps.

825. As far back as 1885?—No; I would not be sure. I cannot be sure as to dates, but I know the system has prevailed.

826. Regularly?—Not regularly, as far as I know. It was in cases of a special rush, such as the North-West Rebellion, and cases where the work necessitated the clerks remaining over time. Sometimes nearly every night the staff was doubled up and made to work. I know cases of that kind necessitated the increasing of the staff, and adding to the expense. The clerks of the Department work overtime, and I know it was the custom, at least, so far as I was concerned, to allow the clerks to work overtime.

827. I would like you to say how long this has been the custom?—Well, it has been the custom perhaps since 1884 or 1885; it may be further.

828. What year did you go into the service?—In 1882.

829. You commenced drawing it about 1884?—Yes; I was an extra clerk at that time.

830. When were you made a permanent clerk?—In 1885 or 1886.

831. You are speaking from your own recollection. What year did you commence to draw extra pay?—At the time of the North-West Rebellion.

832. And who was working with you then? As I understand it, you worked two together?—All the clerks of the Department were working overtime then.

833. You worked in couples, did you not? And the extra man was paid by the service?—Not necessarily that we worked in couples; the North-West Rebellion gave rise to a great deal of extra work.

834. Yes; we all know that, but in 1885, you say you were appointed a permanent clerk?—Yes.

835. At that time you commenced to get extra pay?—No; it was not in that year. It was in the year following, I think in 1886.

836. Well, in 1886 you commenced to get extra pay?—Not for work I did myself, understand that.

837. Well, who did you get it for?—Mr. McCabe mentioned here the case of an account that went through. Mr. McCabe had been working overtime amongst a large number of others, and I had been busy at that time, as Mr. Burgess can tell you; I worked so hard that it brought on a fit of nervous prostration, and Dr. Wright attended me. He told me I would have to give up that kind of work and bothering so much about it.

838. What year was this?—In February, 1886. I spoke to Mr. Burgess and said: "I have been working as you know, and I am going to ask for a bonus of \$500 to be put in the Estimates." There were others who had been working too, and I thought that \$500 was about a fair return for the work that had been done. Mr. Burgess told me: "No; it would take a good deal of trouble to get that; I will perhaps promote you." That was all the conversation that passed between Mr. Burgess and myself, and Mr. Burgess gave me to understand this would count in my getting promotion. Then I let the bonus go. I spoke to Mr. McCabe about the matter. He was an extra clerk. I said: "We cannot get the bonus through; you are an extra clerk, you had better get it in the extra way."

839. Was that for Mr. McCabe? - Mr. McCabe did the work; I only received the money. Mr. McCabe did the work. He did work enough to cover the account, and a great deal more.

840. In 1886?—Yes.

841. How much did you get?—I do not remember the exact amount.

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

842. About \$73, it is stated?—That is about it.

843. How much did you get of that?—Mr. McCabe says he handed me the whole of it, and I do not deny getting it.

844. If McCabe did the work, how did you come to get the money?—He gave it to me. I considered it was McCabe's, legally and honestly.

By Mr. Somerville :

845. McCabe must be a very generous man?—I suppose he is.

846. Did you get the whole of that \$73?—I do not recollect the exact amount, but he says he handed the whole of it to me.

847. When you took the whole of that, you knew you were contravening the Civil Service Act?—No. The money was legally McCabe's; it was properly his, and if he chose to hand me that money it was his affair. I may state that shortly before this there was a charge made against him that he had made a serious mistake in a letter, by leaving out the word "not" where it should have been, and as a consequence he was threatened with dismissal. I looked the case up; I knew him to be a man honourable and big-hearted. I examined the thing, and found he was not responsible. I pointed it out to Mr. Douglas, the then Assistant Secretary, and I said it was too bad to dismiss McCabe for this when it was not his fault. The result was, that McCabe was not dismissed, and he has always regarded me since, I think he will tell you so if you ask him, as a true friend of his. I do not say it was on this account that he handed me the money, but it may have been.

848. He did the work, and handed you the money?—Yes; and it is a matter of his own account.

849. Did you certify to this account?—I think that I did.

850-1. When you certified to that account, did you have any expectation of getting the money from him?—I left that to Mr. McCabe.

852. You had an idea, then?—I had an idea I would get something.

853. Was it left on your desk?—No; it was handed to me by Mr. McCabe.

By Mr. Watson :

854. Was it forced on you?—No; I think it was handed to me on the street.

855. That transpired in 1887?—I do not remember; have you got the accounts?

By Mr. Lister :

856. Did you get money in 1887?—I do not remember.

By Mr. Hyman :

857. Will you swear you did not?—I won't swear I did not. Excuse me, sir, what is your name?

MR. HYMAN.—Hyman is my name.

By Mr. Somerville :

658. Do you know Mr. Ogden?—I know Alfred Ogden.

859. He used to be a member of Parliament?—He was member for Guysboro; I believe.

860. Is he in the Department now?—No; he is away in Nova Scotia now.

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

861. What is he doing?—I think he is superintendent of fisheries.

By Mr. Somerville :

862. How long has he had that appointment?—I think since the first of July.

863. He was a candidate down there at the general elections?—Yes; I think against Mr. Fraser.

863a. Was he in the service of the Department up to the time he entered the campaign?—No; the date of his resignation is there, and the date of the campaign you know. I think it was the 1st of February when he resigned. There were rumours of the election coming on, as you know, and it was some time just before that he resigned his appointment, as he was an expectant candidate.

864. Did you ever certify to an account for Mr. Ogden?—I did.

865. Do you remember a particular account for \$95 that you certified to for Mr. Ogden?—No; but I certified accounts for Mr. Ogden. I acknowledge that.

866. Did you ever get any share of the accounts you certified for Mr. Ogden?—I do not know that I did, but I will explain my relation to Mr. Ogden. When he first came into the Department of the Interior he was, to use a very familiar expression, very hard up.

867. Sick, did you mean?—Financially straitened. His family were in Halifax, and he was here with no money, and Mr. Allison, another ex-M.P., from Nova Scotia—

868. Was he hard-up, too?—I do not know, but he was getting a salary. Well, when Mr. Allison was going to the North-West he came to me and said: "Ogden is going into the Interior Department," he was trying to get Ogden into his place: "he is very hard up; will you sign with me and another gentleman a note for \$100, to relieve him?" I said "I do not know Mr. Ogden, except to see him, and he has no claim on me, but if he is in such desperate straits as you say I will sign the note."

869. You signed with whom?—With Mr. Allison and Mr. Douglas Stewart, of the Department of Justice. Mr. Ogden got the money and paid off the note occasionally, \$10 or \$5 at a time.

870. To whom?—To the gentlemen who advanced the money and who held the note. I myself at the end paid \$20 on that note, and Mr. Ogden at various times handed me back sums of money on this account. Whether these were from extra money he received or from his salary as an extra clerk I did not inquire, but he paid it to me as a legitimate debt on the note as it became due.

871. Did you ever share in pay with Ogden?—Except in that way. I may say, also, that when he went down to Nova Scotia, at one time I loaned him \$100. He was going down into business when the Short Line opened to St. John. He explained to me that he had got freight rates from the Canadian Pacific Railway, and told me the prices he would pay in St. John and what he would receive in Montreal, and what a grand chance it was. I said: "Here is the chance of a lifetime, and I will give it you if you cannot get it anywhere else." He could not get it anywhere else, and so I gave him the money.

872. You swear you did not get any money for extra work done by Mr. Ogden?—Unless Mr. Ogden paid it to me as a legitimate debt. That is the only answer I can give.

By Mr. Lister :

873. Did you certify to any of his accounts?—Yes; because I knew the work was done.

874. With the understanding that you were to be paid?—No. If the Committee wishes, I can not only procure a statement of his work, but the actual pages he did.

By Mr. Montague :

875. Was he a permanent clerk?—No; an extra clerk.

By Mr. Somerville :

876. Referring to the work of the clerks, did you examine it before certifying to the accounts?—I said that on all possible occasions I examined the work. Where I could not examine, we had to trust to the honour of the clerk making the account.

877. In 1888–89 did you get anything from Mr. Ogden?—Nothing, except in payment of legitimate debts.

878. Did he not present you with a watch at one time for allowing him to get a cheque?—Mr. Ogden offered me a silver watch. He wanted me at one time to share an account with him. He said I am indebted to you for a great many favours, Mr. Nelson.

879. For what—sharing?—No for speaking to Mr. Hall and Mr. Burgess on his behalf and for loaning him money. When he got a cheque he said: "It is not fair to take the whole of this myself," and I said: "You know I cannot touch it, Ogden." He had a silver watch which he wanted to sell, and I said I will trade you my watch for yours, and I gave him my silver watch for his silver watch.

By Mr. Hyman :

880. Which was the more valuable?—Well, I thought Ogden's was the more valuable.

881. You knew you were getting the better watch?—Yes. This is one of the instances which shows the animus against me.

By Mr. Lister :

882. What do you mean by "animus"?—This is one of the smallest instances I have ever heard of. I heard it was to be brought up against me.

By Mr. Somerville :

883. Do I understand that you received the watch as payment of your part of the cheque that you were sharing with Mr. Ogden?—No. Mr. Ogden wanted me to take money, and I said: You know I cannot take it, and, another thing, do not try and force it on me.

884. I want to know what you mean by this "animus"?—I have heard—one of my friends told me that they were after me particularly.

885. Who were after you?—I do not know whom.

886. Where?—I do not know where.

By Mr. Lister :

887. You refused absolutely to take Mr. Ogden's earnings?—Yes.

888. And whatever you received was paid in satisfaction of a debt due you?—Yes.

888a. Did he apply all the moneys he received as extra pay for these debts?—He only paid the debts when they became due; I do not know where he got the money, whether it was from his salary cheque or from extra pay.

888b. You certified his accounts?—Yes; and I knew what money he was drawing. I have the actual work.

888c. You knew how much he was drawing as extra pay?—Yes.

888d. And he suggested sharing this with you?—Yes.

888e. And you refused?—Yes; I refused to have anything to do with it.

889. It is a pity you did not do so all along?—It is a pity.

890. When did he make these offers to you?—I do not remember when it was.

891. As late as 1890?—Some time then.

892. And you got the \$20 in 1890?—Yes.

893. Was it before that that Ogden offered you a share?—I am not sure; I could not answer that. I do not remember the date at all.

894. Do you know how much Ogden paid you altogether?—No; I do not remember how much he paid me altogether.

895. You have no account of it at all?—No; I did not keep any account.

896. How long was Ogden in the Department?—About 18 months.

897. And you have no idea at all how much he paid you?—No.

898. His last cheque was \$100?—I do not know; I loaned him \$100.

899. Was that paid back in a bulk sum?—I do not remember; I also loaned Mr. Ogden \$20.

By Mr. Hyman :

900. As a matter of fact, you do not know whether he has paid the money back that you loaned him or not. He may have paid you more or less?—He may have paid me more or less. I was under the impression that he owed me a little when he left the Department.

901. Did you speak to him about it?—I spoke to him about it, and we were satisfied to call quits.

902. Let us understand about the watch question. Do I understand you that Ogden approached you to join with him in getting money which was not his due?—No; Ogden earned the money legitimately, according to law. I certified to his accounts; he drew the money, and he thought I was entitled to a share of it.

903. Why should he offer the watch, then, if he had earned it legitimately?—He wanted me to share the money with him, and then he offered me the watch. I said, "This won't do; it is contrary to the Civil Service Act;" and I said: "You know that, Ogden." He said: "All right. I wish you would take something for your kindness," and he kept on at me.

904. What do you mean when you say it was contrary to the Act?—It was contrary to the Civil Service Act for a permanent official to take money for extra work. I told Ogden so, and then we changed watches. His was a silver watch with a silver case. I afterwards exchanged the case with McMillan, the jeweller, on Rideau street. It was a good time-keeper. I said to him: I will make a trade with you in watches; but I do not suppose there was \$5 difference between them. We made a trade of watches, which is all there is in it.

905. You told Ogden it was contrary to the Act to take this money, or was it contrary to the Act always?—I do not know that it is contrary to the Act to take money from a man who owes it to you. I said to him, however, I could not take any money on account of extra work. He got a regular salary of \$2 per day, and once in a while extra money, and with this money he paid his legitimate debts with both accounts. I do not know whether it was from his salary or his extra money.

By Mr. Somerville :

906. The fact is, that this system which prevailed throughout the Department you knew to be a case of sharing with permanent clerks?—I knew it in my own case.

907. You actually received money from these extra clerks and shared with them?—I have acknowledged receiving this money—this money that was earned by Mr. McCabe.

907a. You say you did not receive any money from Mr. Ogden, except such as he owed you?—Except what paid his legitimate debts.

By Mr. Lister :

908. Do you remember the amount he wanted to share with you?—I do not remember the month, and I do not know if I could specify the account.

909. Was he owing you?—Yes. The note we signed, that we were liable for, was all he owed me for.

910. It would have been so much on it. How much was that debt?—I did not take the money from Mr. Ogden then.

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

911. I do not know whether you were in during the whole of the time, but another witness who was under examination and under oath stated that he had received the sum of \$95 or \$100 for preparing the report of the Department, in which you had assisted him. Do you recollect that?—I do not recollect that particular transaction. I know Mr. Ogden assisted me, and I know he got paid for it.

912. Did he receive extra pay?—Perhaps there was extra pay. I cannot state the exact amount.

913-8. You do not recollect anything about that?—I recollect Mr. Ogden doing the report with me, and I recollect him getting paid for it, and I recollect going over the account for it; but the exact amount I do not remember.

By the Chairman :

919. Did you prepare the the whole of that report?—It was done under my supervision, with Mr. Ogden's assistance.

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

920. That particular sum which was paid to Mr. Ogden for preparing this report under your supervision, did you receive any portion of it?—I have to state again that I have no recollection of that specific amount, and my recollection tells me there was no such large amount—no more than \$40 or \$50. That we could easily ascertain from the accounts.

921. That was the statement made?—If that witness could produce the account it would speak for itself. If there was any such account I could not have received any part of it.

922. The statement made by the witness was that you and Mr. Ogden generally prepared the report?—That is correct.

923. But that sum was divided between you. You say that is not the case?—That is not the case; I received no part of it.

924. I have nothing to say with regard to Mr. Ogden, but if there was extra work you received no part of that?—No.

By Mr. Daly :

925. Do I understand you to say you did not receive from Mr. Ogden any money out of the extra pay he received, except to repay you the legitimate debts he owed you?—Only legitimate debts. I do not know whether he paid me one dollar of that extra money or whether it was his regular salary.

926. You do not know whether there was any understanding about it?—No.

927. Was there any understanding between you and Mr. McCabe?—I did not speak to Mr. McCabe.

928. Was there any understanding with Palmer? Was there any understanding between you and Palmer by which you were to share this extra pay?—No. There may have been that understanding between Mr. Palmer and McCabe; but between myself and McCabe there had been no conversation about it.

By Mr. Bowell :

929. You have stated that you certified to the account of Mr. Ogden. Did you ever certify to any account for Mr. Ogden for which work had not been performed?—No; I am sure of that.

930. Mr. Palmer stated here that you said when asked to present an account—you told him—you did not like to take it to Mr. Burgess?—I do not know anything about the second; but the first I told him I did not like to take to Mr. Burgess until I had an explanation. I am satisfied Mr. McCabe did the work. He worked a great deal overtime and he always had a legitimate claim for overwork.

931. Was that because you could not tell Mr. Burgess about the work?—I enquired first if the work was done. Then I told Mr. Burgess that the work was done.

932. Mr. Burgess was particular?—Yes.

By Mr. Montague :

933. Do you know of any accounts having been certified to for which work was not done?—No.

By Mr. Foster :

934. This system of sharing with permanent clerks—was that undertaken to provide for press of work?—For unusual press of work. I do not know what Mr. Burgess' views were, but mine are that to increase the staff to meet the demands of that work would entail ten times or a hundred times the expense on the Government; because, when a man comes into the Department it is hard to get rid of him. Mr. Burgess is a man of hard-working habits himself, and it was his idea that clerks should do the same. So, instead of engaging outside clerks to come in, thereby increasing the staff, we doubled up the staff we had, in order to meet the emergency.

935. So that, although we agreed to it having been irregular, the work was more economically done than it would have been done under other circumstances?—As far as my knowledge goes, I am satisfied the work was done, and I am also satisfied that under this system tens of thousands of dollars have been saved to the Treasury.

By Mr. Somerville :

936. With reference to this first cheque which Palmer says Nelson asked him to share with McCabe, what do you say?—I deny that point-blank.

937. And that you gave him \$5 for McCabe's share?—I deny that.

938. And that you refused to take the second account to Burgess?—The second account I know nothing of.

By Mr. Taylor :

939. You did not give \$4 to Palmer to take to McCabe on the second cheque?—No; nor \$5 on the other.

By Mr. Hyman :

940. What do you mean by "system"?—You cannot hair-split on my words. I know it was a system that prevailed.

941. That permanent clerks should get work as extra clerks?—I say I do not know of any instances except my own. I have heard rumours.

By Mr. Montague :

942. Have you had any conversation with Palmer since he was dismissed?—No; I have met him a number of times on the street, but have not had any conversation with him.

By Mr. Somerville :

943. You say this system which has been established in the Department has saved tens of thousands of dollars to the Government?—Yes.

944. Then it must have been a system?—If I used the word "system" I should have said practice.

945. You said this practice has saved the Government tens of thousand of dollars. Do you mean annually?—No; not annually. I think it would take ten or twenty clerks at times.

946. It was with the full knowledge of the heads of the Department that this practice was established?—I know nothing about that. You will have to ask the heads of the Department.

947. Did Mr. Burgess know anything about this?—I told Mr. Burgess this work had been done by Mr. McCabe.

948. You know this practice was prevailing in this Department for years?—I did not know it.

949. Why did you say it saved ten thousand dollars a year?—By making clerks work over time.

950. You said, the practice of doing this work with extra clerks and sharing with them?—I did not say sharing. I mean the practice of making clerks come back and do the work, whether they got paid or not. I did not say anything about extra pay.

951. You know, as a matter of fact, that work has been done by permanent clerks and they have been paid for it?—I have heard it rumoured.

952. Did you ever hear of the Joseph Wright case?—No; until the thing came up here.

953. There were general rumours to that effect?—I have heard them.

954. Mr. Burgess never knew you shared this money?—What money?

955. With McCabe.—No.

Mr. Bowell asked at the last meeting of the Committee during the examination of Mr. Burgess:—

“488. I understand you to say no permanent clerk in your Department has received any extra pay”? and he replied: “Only Mr. Turner.”

956. You do not know of any?—No; I can only speak from my own experience. I know Mr. Burgess was not aware any of this money was given to me. I suppose it is a revelation to him now.

By Mr. Bowell :

957. Who suggested this mode of evading the law?—I do not know. I suppose each man did it for himself.

By Mr. Bergeron :

958. With how many clerks could you, if you had wanted, shared in the Department?—I have no idea.

959. How many accounts could you have certified to there? You have mentioned Mr. Ogden, Mr. McCabe and Mr. Palmer.—There were a large number of extra clerks in the Department.

960. How many are there beside these three?—I do not know how many extra clerks there are in the Department.

961. How many could you have certified for?—I do not know.

962. I want an answer.—I do not know.

963. How many clerks have you under you?—I have one extra clerk under my charge. A little while ago I had three under my charge, and at another time I had two.

By the Chairman :

964. How many permanent clerks?—A short time ago I had two permanents and now I have one. Sometimes the clerks were not under my charge, although they were in the same office.

By Mr. Bowell :

965. The Deputy Minister had no other way of finding out how many hours these men had work but by you?—He had to take my word for it.

By Mr. Hyman :

966. I see your name appears for \$1,200 in June, 1890. Did you receive any other moneys except those you have told us about?—No. The accounts will be here.

967. I am speaking of the accounts in your name?—No.

968. Did you receive any other moneys, except what appears in your name?

Mr. A. M. BURGESS.—Might I be allowed to make a statement. I simply beg to state that in the excitement of the moment at the last meeting, in answer to a question by Mr. Somerville, as quoted to-day, I stated what I would very seriously modify to-day—that is, that I knew of no cases in the Department. I thought it was Mr. Foster who asked me the question, and I understood it to refer to the preparation of the Burr Index: “Did I know whether any permanent clerks had shared in the money paid for extra work?” That is what I understand the question to be. If I had understood it to be otherwise I should have answered it otherwise. I did know of a practice prevailing in the Department in several instances, of which I am quite prepared to give a list to the Committee at the next meeting. That is why I would prefer to keep my statement until the next meeting, so that I may accompany it with a list of those cases in which this practice has prevailed.

By the Chairman :

969. Your answer had reference to the Burr Index?—Yes; when occasional extra work was given to other clerks, or their female relatives, for the express object of making up their salary.

By Mr. Foster :

970. Permanent clerks?—Yes.

971. In those cases, did you know that full work was given?—I say so positively. I took the greatest pains in those cases.

By Mr. Bowell :

972. Could you tell us—because there may be some misapprehension about this—if you know of any cases in which permanent clerks received money for work done by friends of theirs and for which they themselves did no work?—I know of no cases of that kind. I did know of cases in which the relatives of permanent clerks were paid for the work which the permanent clerks did themselves.

By Mr. Foster :

972a. Your answer the other day was under a misapprehension?—Yes; under a misapprehension. I take the opportunity of saying so now.

By Mr. Montague :

973. I understand you to say you did not know that certain permanent clerks were doing extra work and getting extra money in this irregular way?—Yes; I did.

By Mr. Somerville :

974. You say the relatives of these permanent clerks were drawing pay as for extra service?—Well, I understand they were relatives.

975. The wives of these men?—In some cases the wives.

976. Do you know the name of Miss Lizzie Evans?—I cannot say; I thought I knew who she was.

977. Do you know Miss Lucy Evans?—I think I know both of them.

978. Miss Lizzie Evans got \$231.60 in 1886 and \$280.80 in 1887. You don't know who she is? She would be the wife of some clerk?—I don't think she was the wife; she was a cousin, I think, of the wife of Mr. Pereira, the Assistant Secretary.

979. She was the cousin of the wife?—Yes; she was living at Pereira's house, so I understand. I profess no personal knowledge of that.

980. Do you know Miss Lucy Evans?—I understood she was the sister of Miss Lizzie, but of my own personal knowledge I don't know. In 1886, and these days when there was an enormous quantity of work being done by the Department, I don't pretend to know one-half of those who were at work.

By Mr. Montague:

981. So this practice allowed, was the means of avoiding the Civil Service Act for the purpose of fraudulently giving money to these clerks, was allowed by you as a matter of economy?—It was allowed by me as a matter of economy.

982. There was no intention of defrauding the public?—No; and I have no reason to suppose any fraud was ever committed; I took the strictest pains to assure myself on that point.

By Mr. Bergeron:

983. You heard a witness state a moment ago that he certified to accounts. You had confidence in him that he would not deceive you?—Unless they were officers of that kind about me my position would be intolerable.

By Mr. Montague:

984. You believe every dollar paid there, was for work done?—I will go further than that, and say there were many thousand dollars of extra work if you count everything, even the official day.

By Mr. Somerville:

985. When this work was being done, in that way you knew there were permanent men who, were receiving a share of the money for the work done by the extra clerks, had read the Civil Service Act, did you not?—I thought so.

986. Well, you knew that more men were required to take the oath?—Yes.

987. You knew the nature of that oath?—I would not like to say that was present to my mind at any time while this arrangement was in force.

988. You knew of the oath?—I always knew of it, because I took it myself; it was not present to my mind. Moreover, I would not have allowed it.

989. But you remember the oath?—I must have known it; I would be very poorly fitted for the office which I fill if I did know that. I had no idea whatever I was doing the injury. The injury it appears I was doing, I am sure I had no intention of it.

By Mr. Montague:

990. I understood you to say that if you had employed outside clerks the sum spent would be much larger than under the present system?—Yes; I would go further, and say a good deal of the work could not have been done by people outside. It had to be done by people who knew the Department.

By Mr. Somerville:

991. Do you know anything about the account (produced)?—No; I know nothing about it. Mr. Nelson reminds me I had made some objection about it, but I don't remember.

MR. NELSON.—I remember you enquiring, "What is McCabe doing?"

MR. BURGESS.—It is very likely.

The Committee then adjourned.

COMMITTEE ROOM,
THURSDAY, 16th July, 1891.

Committee met; Mr. WALLACE in the Chair.

Mr. FOSTER presented a statement in reply to an allegation of Mr. Palmer that of the 15 clerks who had been dismissed from the Interior Department on the 30th June, all had been re-instated except two or three, which statement was filed as Exhibit No. 3, and is as follows:—

(EXHIBIT No. 3.)

I examined the pay list for this month, and find that none of these names appear, and no cheques have been made out for any of them: E. P.

- J. F. Cross—Gone.
 B. H. Humphreys—Transferred to the Winnipeg office, to fill a vacancy in the Land Office there, caused by the creation of the Lake Dauphin Land Agency and the Red Deer Land Agency.
 H. Palmer—Dismissed.
 Mrs. Graburn—Gone.
 Mrs. Forrest—Gone.
 Miss Slater—Gone.
 C. E. Anderson—Gone (waiting for proposed gratuity in Supplementary Estimates). Loss of an eye.
 J. A. Hickey—Gone; came back a few days after the 30th June.
 P. Mungovan—Gone.
 A. R. Bethune—Gone.
 G. V. York—Gone.
 Samuel Gray—Transferred to Regina Agency for same reason as Humphreys went to Winnipeg.
 T. W. Hodgins—Notified at the beginning of the month that his services were ended and that he could no longer be paid, but has been hanging about the buildings.
 William Peart—Gone.
 R. D. O'Brien—Gone; gratuity asked for in Supplementary Estimates on account of old age. (Nine years in service.)

Mr. BURGESS read the following statement, which was filed as Exhibit No. 4, and is as follows:—

(EXHIBIT No. 4.)

OTTAWA, 15th July, 1891.

Mr. CHAIRMAN—I crave the permission of the Committee to submit a written statement in explanation of the extra payments which have been made to permanent clerks in the Department of the Interior and the circumstances which led to these payments being made.

I was secretary to the Deputy Minister of the Interior in 1881 when the contract was entered into between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. At that time the staff of the Department was quite equal to the work to be done, but on account of the enormous expansion of the Departmental business which followed upon the completion of the contract and the commencement of work on the road, Colonel Dennis, then Deputy Minister, became incapacitated from overwork and retired from the service at the end of the year. After the 1st January, 1882, a

reorganization of the Department took place, which it was hoped would increase its efficiency so that the work might be overtaken. Mr. Lindsay Russell, Surveyor General, was appointed Deputy Minister, and a new branch was created to conduct the correspondence, with myself at the head of it as Secretary. However, the work grew out of all proportion to the machinery in existence for its conduct, and early in 1883 Mr. Russell was compelled to give up work, and has been incapacitated from business ever since. I was then charged with the duties of Deputy Minister, and on the 1st July, 1883, was confirmed in the position. About that time the Government made every effort to strengthen the working power of the staff. Mr. Hall, the present Secretary, was transferred from the Department of Justice to succeed me in that office; Mr. Joseph Pope, now the Prime Minister's Private Secretary, and Mr. Arthur Chisholm, now Private Secretary to the Minister of the Interior, were transferred from the Department of Marine; and about this time, also, Mr. T. G. Rothwell, a solicitor in active practice in Ottawa, Mr. G. U. Ryley, a Dominion Land Surveyor, now in charge of the Timber and Mines Branch, and Mr. L. C. Pereira, now Assistant Secretary, were brought into the Department. With these and other subsequent additions to the staff, the business was systematized, and had been brought into a state of efficiency when, in the spring of 1885, the North-West Half-breed Commission was appointed. All the labour attendant upon the organization of the Commission and the preparation of the instructions fell to the share of the Minister and myself, but when the Commission got to work in the North-West and began to send in batches of claims which they had investigated and approved, it was found that there was no provision in the organization of the Department for doing special work, such as the issue of scrip for these claims. I regarded it as important that the issue of this scrip should be surrounded by the same safeguards as the payment of money, and it was arranged that no scrip should be drawn except upon requisitions signed by myself and countersigned by the Chief Clerk of Patents, in whose branch the recommendations of the Commissioners were examined and classified. The requisitions were then transmitted to the Accountant, in whose office the scrip notes were prepared for signature, the same as ordinary cheques.

During the session of 1885, also, there was an unusual demand from Parliament for information respecting the Department of the Interior; and the Rebellion also added enormously to the work, both directly and indirectly. The volunteers who took part in its suppression were granted by the Military Bounty Act the choice of 320 acres of land on homestead conditions, or land scrip for \$80. It was necessary to communicate with each volunteer to ascertain his option, and as in many cases the volunteer disposed of his right, powers of attorney had to be filed in the Department to enable the purchasers to receive the scrip or warrant, as the case might be. As there were over 6,000 of these cases, the correspondence of the Department was greatly augmented.

All this additional business was thrown on the staff almost simultaneously, and as there was no provision in the organization of the Department for conducting it very great pressure of work existed in the offices of the Secretary and the Accountant. It became a question whether an effort should be made to overtake the work by the ordinary staff or whether the Government should be asked to devise some special means of meeting the exigency. The officers, especially the Accountant and his assistant, protested strongly at various times that the pressure upon them was too great, to which my invariable answer was, that the work must be done and that I would endeavour to find some means of remunerating the staff for their extra labour. This class of business was spread over the years 1885, 1886, 1887, and part of 1888-89, and in these years there was also added the office business connected with the Civil Rebellion losses claims. These claims were investigated on the ground by a Commission, but the necessary steps to make payment for the losses fell to the share of the Department of Interior.

In 1886 the Department commenced to wind up the business between the various colonization societies and the Government, and this work has been spread

over the intervening years. The following summary of scrip notes of various kinds which have been drawn in the Accountant's office and issued by the Department in those years will give some idea of the extent of this special class of work :—

Manitoba Supplementary Half-breed scrip.....	1,717
North-West Half-breed scrip	5,790
Scrip in commutation of the right of hay and common on the Red and Assiniboine Rivers.....	235
Old white settlers' scrip.....	96
Military Bounty scrip and land warrants.....	6,106
Colonization societies' scrip.....	3,896
Total	<u>17,837</u>

All this work was intermittent in its character, and had to be performed in addition to the regular duties of the persons to whom it was entrusted. It would have been difficult to obtain outside assistance whenever and only for such periods as might be necessary, and, even if obtainable, such assistance would be of little value without previous experience of the business methods of the Department.

The annual report of the Department is brought down, in so far as the various agencies in Manitoba, the North-West and British Columbia are concerned, to the 31st October each year, and in fact a statement of all the business of importance down to the close of the calendar year is included. The surveyors employed by the Department usually do not return from the field until November, and between the end of the year and soon after the opening of the session of Parliament their reports upon the season's operations, as well as the reports of the Crown Lands and Crown Timber Agents from Lake Superior to the Pacific Coast, have to be collected, carefully revised, the proofs read, and the whole summarized, indexed and printed. This means that a very large amount of work is crowded into a short time. It can only be done, or at all events be done far better, by regular employes.

At the end of the financial year, too, there is, in so large a Department, necessarily a great amount of extra labour in closing up and balancing the appropriation accounts of the Department, the accounts of the North-West Government and of the Government of the District of Keewatin, and the accounts connected with the Torrens system of registration.

The selection of the material required for returns to Parliament, the distribution of the files among the sessional writers who copy them, and the examination and certification of the copies composing the return, has for many years made very large demands upon the time of the regular employes in addition to their everyday duties. I find on examination that the cost of copying, at a given rate per folio, the returns called for since 1884, has been as follows :—

1884-85	\$6,369 50
1885-86	2,912 00
1886-87	1,100 00
1887-88.....	952 05
1888-89.....	780 00
1889-90.....	700 00
Total.....	<u>\$12,813 55</u>

In addition to the mere copying, however, it is necessary for some officer to select the material to be copied, and subsequently care has to be taken that the proper documents have been copied and that they are correct copies. Of course, such information as can be extracted from the records of the Department is furnished, as in the case of all other Departments, without involving extra expenses.

With a correspondence averaging, for the past five years, over 47,500 letters received per annum, not perhaps all of very great importance, but all requiring to be attended to and answered (involving, in most instances, also, a reference to the land registrars or survey records of the Department), and requiring to be carefully indexed, registered and filed, so as to be easily found when required, it is necessary that the officers and clerks of the Department generally should not adhere to the office hours of 9.30 to 4 o'clock, and I think it will be seen by the Committee that additional demands of the nature I have been describing (the list of which could be greatly amplified if necessary), upon the time of the regular employes, must mean great pressure of work and the devotion to their duties of a large amount of extra time.

I desire here to state most emphatically that no payment was ever authorized by me except for work which was certified by the proper officer to have been performed or where I had personal knowledge of the fact myself. It was as a rule work of an important and pressing nature, which could not have been performed within official hours, nor to the best of my judgment and belief by others than the permanent employees of the Department. This is not stated by way of defence, but to show that the Government received actual value for every dollar that was expended in this way. In every instance, so far as I can remember, this work was done and the payments made in pursuance of a previous arrangement with the clerks, and none of the payments were in any sense a gratuity.

The payment made to the late Mr. Anderson was irregular, but this was not a payment made to a permanent official. Except in this instance, none of the employes who have benefited by these irregular payments are connected with me in any way, directly or indirectly. None of them, so far as I know, regard the office hours as the necessary limit of their labours; but, on the contrary, it must be within the personal knowledge of a very large number of the Committee that they do not as a rule leave their offices until between 5 or 6 o'clock each day; and they are always ready to return if necessary. Nor would I have the Committee to understand that any attempt has been made to make even the appearance of compensation to the permanent employes in question for all the extra labour they perform.

I have gone carefully through that portion of the Auditor General's Reports having reference to the accounts of this Department for the years 1885-86 to 1889-90, inclusive, with a view to discovering how much, to my personal knowledge, has been paid to permanent officers, exclusive of what Mr. Turner got. The amount is so small that I hesitate about submitting it to the Committee, being only \$1,818.45, or about \$360 per annum. As to the payments made indirectly to permanent clerks, of which I have no knowledge, it is impossible for me at the present time to ascertain the exact amounts, but I believe them to be inconsiderable.

In addition to the statement which I made to the Committee at its last meeting in relation to the Burr Index of correspondence, I may say that when, in the first instance, Mr. Henry stated that permanent clerks had been employed on the making of this index I felt sure that I had no knowledge of this, and, as already explained, that was what I intended to say to the Committee. I have taken every means in my power to refresh my memory on this point, and I am of the same belief still. I, of course, have had no communication with Mr. Henry, but I have no recollection of any conversation with him, either before the work was commenced or while it was going on which would indicate that permanent men were to be so employed. He stated to the Committee that what he did in this relation was authorized by his superior officer. I presume he refers to Mr. Hall, the Secretary of the Department. I do not recollect whether Mr. Hall ever told me that any permanent clerks were assisting in the making of the index and sharing the proceeds with the temporary clerks so employed. The question of the index, however, was frequently discussed between us, and in order that this matter may be cleared up beyond doubt I have telegraphed to Mr. Hall, who is absent in Boston on his holidays, to return here. If, when Mr. Hall comes before the Committee, he will say that he informed me that permanent men were so employed I

have no doubt that such was the fact, since I well know of the existence of the practice in the Department, and had authorized it in other specific cases. Whether I knew of it in this instance or not is not of much importance. It is an undoubted fact, I believe, that the junior clerks in Mr. Henry's office were so employed, and that they were paid in the manner indicated. I remember that the work upon the index was stopped some time during 1890, on a representation made by Mr. Hall, the nature of which I cannot recall, and it has made no progress since. It is a large index of a series of smaller indices, and its usefulness as a work of reference is chiefly in relation to the earlier papers composing the Departmental records, particularly title papers, and even what has already been done—it is almost complete from 1870 down to the close of 1882—has expedited the work of the Department very greatly. I agree with the opinion expressed by Mr. Henry, that it would be a tedious, and I am afraid an impossible task, to bring it up to date by any system of working which could be applied to it during office hours.

I would also state that upon further examination I find that the extra time for which Mr. Turner was paid, as explained at the last meeting of the Committee, was spent to a much greater extent in examining Half-breed scrip files and preparing the scrip notes for signature, examining, classifying and scheduling Rebellion losses claims, and in writing up the Establishment Ledgers of the Department, than in the work of checking and making a regular account of scrip and warrants of all kinds issued prior to 1883.

I am reported as saying that Jane Hay, one of the persons mentioned in the letter of the Clerk of the Committee to the Secretary of the Department, whose presence here for the purpose of giving evidence was desired, has been employed in the Technical Branch of the Department. What I thought I said, and what I had intended to say was that I was, informed and believe that Jane Hay is a real and not a fictitious person, and that she has been paid for work performed in one of the branches of the Department. I understand that she is a relative of a third-class clerk in the Department, who, at the time of his appointment, was a Public school teacher in Ottawa, at a salary, I am informed, of over \$600 per annum. He was selected for appointment during the year 1887 because he was a good stenographer and typewriter, and assistance of that kind was and is indispensable in conducting the large correspondence of the Department. I understood at the time that he was promised a salary of \$600 per annum to commence with, on the presumption, no doubt, that he had passed in a sufficient number of optional subjects to entitle him to that amount. It transpired, however, that he had not passed in any optionals, although fairly well qualified in the two mentioned; and he could only be appointed at \$400 per annum. There is no doubt that the object of giving the extra writing was to make up the deficiency. Since the close of the financial year ending on the 30th June, 1890, the payment in question has been discontinued.

I have seen in one newspaper a suggestion that in May, 1887, when I paid Mr. Thomas Anderson \$100, that gentleman was dead. I beg to state that Mr. Anderson died on the 23rd January, 1888, having been in his ordinary health up to the previous day, and that when the transaction referred to took place he was a temporary clerk in the Department of the Interior. The same newspaper represents me to have said that the \$100 was never repaid to me. I never intended to make any such statement. Although I did not personally receive this repayment, Mr. Chisholm did so for me.

I have already frankly admitted that the payments complained of have been made in contravention of the provisions of the Civil Service Act, but I repeat that they have invariably been made, so far as I know, for substantial service really rendered and actually necessary in the interest of the business of the Department. I desire to escape no portion of the responsibility which attaches to me in this relation. There is no doubt that the proper way to have obtained for the men who did the work the remuneration to which they were honestly entitled would have been to get a specific appropriation for that purpose. That method is adopted in the Post Office and Finance Departments, and I greatly regret that it was not adopted in the Interior

Department. I would point out, however, that the work so provided for in both the Departments mentioned occurs with perfect regularity at a fixed period of the year that the cost can be very closely calculated in advance and the sanction of Parliament obtained so that the payments can be made when the service is rendered. The amounts paid out irregularly in the Department of the Interior have been mainly for work that could not have been anticipated, but of course the payments might and ought to have been delayed until Parliamentary authority was obtained. I respectfully submit that the irregularity is one which does not involve my honour or my honesty.

I would also take leave to say, Mr. Chairman, in relation to the evidence given by Mr. Henry, that I regret very much that in a moment of anger I should have said anything that would reflect upon him. I prefer to believe and do believe, from what I have known of Mr. Henry during the last 16 years, that he made the statement he did and gave the evidence in the way he did from conscientious motives, and believing that it was his duty to do so.

By Mr. Somerville :

992. You said, in giving evidence here at the previous meeting, that this system of paying temporary clerks for work which was afterwards shared with permanent clerks was commenced in 1885, after the Hon. Thomas White was appointed, and that you had a consultation with Mr. White in regard to the method you would adopt in order to pay for that work, and that either you or he suggested that this method should be adopted?—I think I stated that in regard to the case of Mr. Turner only.

993-4. Can you say when the Hon. Thomas White was appointed to office?—I cannot say definitely, but I think it was August, 1885.

995. The 5th August, 1885?—Some time in August, 1885; I do not remember the date.

996. Mr. Turner, then, did not receive any money for extra work previous to that. In fact, in your statement to-day you say that this class of work commenced in 1885?—Yes; this class of work.

997. In your opinion Mr. Turner did not receive any money for extra services previous to 5th August, 1885?—I could not say that. I have no recollection of payments to Turner in this manner before 1886 myself.

998. Your conversation with Mr. White occurred after his appointment?—It must have been after his appointment, of course.

999. And this extra work not having started until after Mr. White's appointment, you must be positive that no money was paid to Turner for work of this character before that?—I could not be positive. I may say that I made no inquiry with a view to ascertaining that; it did not occur to me. I only say that, to my own knowledge, nothing was paid before 1886.

1000. What was the name of the party used by Mr. Turner before Joseph Wright's name?—I do not know. I never knew of any party other than his wife, myself personally.

1001. Do you know what his wife's name was?—I do not.

H. H. TURNER recalled and further examined :—

By Mr. Somerville :

1002. In what name did you receive extra pay previous to receiving it in the name of Joseph Wright?—I received it in the name of my wife altogether.

1003. What was her name?—Emma M. Turner.

1004. Did you receive any in the name of M. E. Slighter?—That is my wife's maiden name.

1005. How did you come to use your wife's maiden name?—I think that was a suggestion of the late Mr. Douglas. As I stated to the Committee before, he said to me that there were certain jealous ones in the Department, and that as I was getting pay for extra work and others had been there longer than I had, they thought they were entitled to it, but could not do the work. The suggestion therefore came from him that I should take my wife's maiden name. I only received but three or four payments that way. I could give you my diary, if you like, showing when I received the money.

1006. The first payment you got, was it in your wife's name or M. E. Slighter's?—It was changed, I think, after the 1st of July, after I had received four or five payments—not a large amount, perhaps \$70 or \$80.

1007. On what date?—1884-85, I think.

1008. At what date in those years?—That is more than I can tell you. My written record shows that I only began on the 1st of January, 1885, and then I have an unbroken record for two years or over.

1009. Before that?—No. I did not receive anything before that. I only came into the Department in the fall of 1883. I had been a temporary clerk for some time before I got my permanent appointment.

1010. What is the date of the first payment in your wife's name?—I could not tell you that unless I had the ledgers.

1011. I would like to know who suggested you should use the name of Miss M. E. Slighter?—Mr. Douglas.

1012. Mr. Douglas?—Yes; he suggested I should change the name to my wife's maiden name, because of jealousy.

1013. You were drawing in your wife's name before you changed?—Yes; I drew three or four amounts, not very large, in all perhaps some \$70 or \$80, but not more than that.

1014. According to my information, which has been taken from the Auditor-General's Report, and which I have not had an opportunity of verifying myself, you received something like \$2,291.80?—I daresay. It would average about \$300 a year.

1015. Sometimes it was \$500 or \$520?—That depended upon the pressure of work.

1016. You did all that work yourself?—I did all the work myself—every bit of it.

1017. I want to know if you shared that work with anybody else?—No; not a bit of it. It was money of my own which was earned by myself, and I used it myself.

1018. Nobody ever got a portion?—Nobody ever got one cent of it.

1019. Here is an account to Miss Slighter, \$251.30. (To the Auditor General): you have not the vouchers for 1884 and 1885, or any record in the books showing when this payment was made.

The AUDITOR GENERAL.—Not in our books; we keep the vouchers every year to be examined by Parliament. Then we send them back to the Department. It happens in this particular case we have not the vouchers. We have the monthly sums in the ledgers, but not all the details.

By Mr. Bowell:

1020. Can you ascertain by the books when this payment was made, Mr. Turner?—I know very well about it myself.

By Mr. Lister:

1021. What is your recollection about that?—I was appointed a permanent clerk some time, I think, in February, 1884. I did not do any extra work for a few months after that time; I should say perhaps it was about the end of 1884 or the beginning of 1885 that I first received any extra pay in this way.

By Mr. Denison:

1022. That was, in your wife's name?—Yes; or in any other name.

By Mr. Lister :

1023. According to your recollection, it would be previous to the time of the appointment of Mr. White, if he was appointed the 5th August, 1885, that you had been receiving money?—I may have received a little money—not very much.

By the Chairman :

1024. You say that the payments were first made in the name of your wife, Mrs. Emma Turner?—Exactly.

1025. And afterwards it was in the name of M. E. Slighter?—Exactly; that is my wife's name, too.

1026. How do you account for the payments in 1884 and 1885, "M. E. Slighter, copying, 10 cents a folio, \$251.30." Was there a payment made in your wife's name before that year?—No.

1027. Well, then, the payments commenced with your wife's maiden name according to this report, in 1884 and 1885?—I don't think it did. There were only two payments made under the name of Turner. The name Turner was drawing attention to me, and it was causing jealousy in the Department, too.

By Mr. Hyman :

1028. Were you drawing payments at one and the same time under your wife's maiden name and under the name of Mrs. Turner?—I think not.

1029. You won't swear you were not?—I could tell if I looked at the books.

By Mr. Lister :

1030. I think what Mr. Hyman means is, that you were drawing an amount of say \$100 in your wife's maiden name, and a sum of \$100 in your own name?—Oh, no; certainly not.

By Mr. Chrysler :

1031. I would like to put one question on behalf of Mr. Burgess. Did you have any conversation with Mr. Burgess on the subject, or had you any means of knowing that he was aware of what took place?—I don't know about that, sir. The work was given to me to do under Mr. Douglas' direction by Mr. Howe, Mr. Rothwell and other parties. I had no dealing with any person except Mr. Douglas. Mr. Douglas was at that time Assistant Secretary of the Department. It was under his order that I did this outside work, and I did the work, and I received the pay, as I have said.

1032. What is your answer to the question as to Mr. Burgess' knowledge, so far as you know, of the payments that you were receiving in 1884 and 1885? Do you know anything about it?—I don't know anything about it.

H. A. PALMER made the following statement to the Committee:—

I wish to apologise for the intemperate language I used the other day, but I don't mean in that apology to include Mr. Nelson. I regret very much in your presence, sir, and the honourable gentlemen, that I made use of that language. I would like also to modify the statement which I made with regard to some one asking me if I had made any statement to any person with regard to the Department. After we got our notices of discharge on the 28th April many of the men who were in the same boat as myself used to come to my room and discuss the thing, and of course I may have said something, just the same as they. They discussed the thing with me and I discussed it with them, but no word was said about giving anything away, except on one or two occasions, and not by me. I suggested a respectful memorial to Mr. Burgess asking him to lay the case before the Honourable Mr. Dewdney, the Minister, asking that he should get an amendment to the Act covering our cases. I have also a recollection of, I think, four or five of us, in company with Mr. Satchell, meeting Mr. Charles Mackintosh. I said: "You are just the gentleman we are look-

ing for." I showed him the notices, I think, which we had received, and asked him as a personal favour if he would interview the Minister or take some action on our behalf, and I stated to Mr. Mackintosh that it would be much better; that there were a great many rumours going around, and a great many threats had been made with regard to showing it up, and I stated if it was shown up the Rykert scandal would be a small matter compared with it, because it was a petty thing, and it would reflect on the Department and the officers of the Department. He said: "Harry, I will see you again," but I never had any communication with Mr. Mackintosh afterwards, with the exception of going down to his house with this petition, asking him to lay it before Mr. Dewdney. That is all the recollection, as far as I know, of any conversation with any outside gentleman outside the Department.

By Mr. Foster :

1033. That is, you only spoke with Mr. Pereira, the men who wanted the same object as yourself, and Mr. Mackintosh?—And the men clerks in the Department, sir, and I think I have had two or three conversations with Mr. Rothwell.

1034. With whom?—Mr. Rothwell. I had nothing of any moment, that is all. We spoke about the Department; that is all, to the best of my recollection. I have heard no threats of any outside party giving anything away, good, bad or indifferent.

By Mr. Montague :

1035. Perhaps you will tell us who did make the threats to Mr. Mackintosh? You say you were justified in making those statements to Mr. Mackintosh. You must have a meaning? You say you spoke to a Liberal member?—I don't say I spoke to a Liberal member; I did not speak to anybody. They came into my room.

1036. Who were they?—Mr. Hickey, Mr. Bethune and Mr. Mongovan.

1037. Who made threats?—I think to the best of my knowledge during one morning—I think Mr. Satchell was present when we were discussing the thing—Mr. Hickey stated if we were discharged "I will write the thing up." That is all; that is the only recollection. I have heard other remarks outside that the thing would be shown up, not by parties connected with the office. That is to the best of my recollection. I made also certain statements to Mr. Hickey with regard to what was going on in the Department. I was entitled, and so was Mr. Hickey, to every dollar we earned, because the law allowed extra clerks to receive full pay for extra service.

By Mr. Foster :

1038. You said threats were being made to Mr. Mackintosh, and the only person you ever heard making threats of showing up the Department was Mr. Hickey?—There were others.

1039. What others?—I could not say exactly, now, sir.

1040. Cannot you remember anyone?—I think there were several who spoke in a general way—if they had to go "We would do so-and-so."

1041. You cannot remember any of their names?—Only with the exception of Mr. Hickey.

By Mr. Bowell :

1042. Did Mr. Satchell?—No; Mr. Satchell did not make any threats.

By Mr. Montague :

1043. Were you among the number?—No; I was not. The Minister was always very good to me. In conversation, I said I was treated with kindness by Mr. White and Mr. Burgess both. I have no complaints, except I thought it was unjust, and I asked Mr. Pereira if Mr. Burgess would grant me an interview.

1044. Then, when they made threats, you disputed with them?—No; I walked out of the Department. I was trying to get a position not in the service at all.

With regard to the reinstatement of these men, I was credibly informed that Mr. Hickey returned to work on the following morning. I saw Mr. Hickey on Saturday morning, and he told me he was offered extra work. He said we could all get extra work, and asked if he should intercede with Mr. Henry to make up what I was getting as a salary. I said: "No, sir; I do not want any favours, good, bad or indifferent in that way." There is a statement made that no person has been returned to the pay-list.

J. L. McDougall called and further examined:—

By Sir Richard Cartwright:

1045. You have been here, and heard the evidence as to the manner in which some permanent clerks have made use of some extra clerks for the purpose of receiving additions to their salary. You are yourself the head of the Department?—Yes.

1046. Is it within your knowledge that such a thing has occurred in your Department?—I am sure it never did.

THOMAS G. ROTHWELL called, sworn and examined:—

By Mr. Somerville:

1047. What branch are you employed in?—I am not employed in any branch; I am law clerk of the Department. It is a departmental title. I do not think it is recognized by the Department of Justice, but I am addressed that way officially by the Department.

1048. Are you the solicitor of the Department?—I look after legal matters. In matters of legal moment my opinion is asked, and if Mr. Burgess is satisfied with it he uses it, and if not he refers it to the Department of Justice; or very often, when opinions are given by the Department of Justice, they are sent to me to look over before Mr. Burgess deals with them.

1049. You have been a long time in the service?—Not very long.

1050. How long?—Eight or nine years.

1051. You, of course, understand the nature of this enquiry. Can you give us any information with regard to certifying to accounts and these irregular payments that have been made?—I am very glad to be able to do so, because I think the matter has not been put fairly before this Committee. The general statement has been made that it is a general practice in the Department for permanent officials and extra clerks to divide payments. That is not true. Certain permanent clerks in the Department of Interior I know have done so. As far as my knowledge is concerned, it is that Mr. Burgess was pressed from time to time by permanent officials, whom I may call juniors, to advance them; and these juniors along with extra clerks have to my knowledge been getting extra pay. Of course, I have heard the evidence here, and it has been brought out that other people got extra pay. I had heard that, too, but not in any way that I care to say anything about.

1052. About what?—That I heard that persons calling themselves officials of our Department were certifying to accounts and taking part of the money themselves.

1053. You heard that?—Yes; certainly.

1054. It is within your knowledge as to who really were engaged in that?—I know from Mr. Nelson's sworn evidence that he did so. I have heard that others did so, but I do not know of it.

1055. Do not know what?—That they certified to accounts themselves and got the money; but I know that they got money from cheques certified to by others.

1056. And shared with others?—I think the work was done by members of the family or something of the kind. I would like to say a little more about the prac-

tice of the Department as I know it. When I went in there in 1883 and 1884 that practice was in existence. I did not think much about it then, but I have a great deal since.

By Mr. Foster :

1057. At that time, when you went in, such a practice was in vogue?—I understand it was in vogue for years, and it is in vogue all through the Departments of the Civil Service in the way I speak of—that is, permanent clerks earning small salaries were receiving extra payments.

By Mr. Somerville :

1058. In contravention of the Statute?—That depends upon the construction put upon it. There has been a very strict construction put upon that clause of the Civil Service Act.

By Mr. Sproule :

1059. The Civil Service Act was only passed in 1882?—A. That was the practice, as far as I know. I have heard talk, but I do not know. There is another point: that extra work has not been distinguished before this Committee. It consisted of two kinds—first, copies of papers, such as returns to Parliament, and other purposes. For instance, when we have papers to send to the Commissioner we send mere copies, and we furnish copies for many other purposes. A good deal of that, however, has been done away with of late. The next class is that spoken of as having been done in the Department by permanents and the cheques being made out in the name of other people for that work. So, there are two classes of work. The class of work that was sworn to here the other day, for which permanent officials were in the habit of certifying to their own accounts and dividing the cheques with unfortunate extra clerks, is something I had only heard of, but did not know until I heard it acknowledged here.

By Mr. Somerville :

1060. You say, then, it was a common practice, according to your explanation, in all the Departments?—I have heard so; but I do not know it.

1061. Heard so from parties in the other Departments?—Just general talk.

1062. You know of no special cases?—I have been told that there were special cases in the different Departments, if I would look in the Auditor-General's books; but I did not wish to become a detective in this business, just because our own Department had got into trouble.

1063. Did you certify to accounts?—I certified to a great many accounts for copies of papers, of returns to Parliament and copies of files that are sent to Commissioners, and copies of papers for other purposes. I have also certified to one account—that is, the account of Jane Hay.

1064. Who is she?—The mother of a junior official in the Department, H. H. Rowatt.

1065. Who did the work?—Rowatt. I will tell you all I know about it. Mr. Rowatt came to me after the death of the late Mr. Douglas, the Assistant Secretary. He told me that he had been receiving sufficient extra work to make his salary up to a stated figure, I think \$600 or \$700. His statement was that he had resigned his position in the Public School, where he was receiving \$600 or \$650; that he had been promised an equal position in the Department of the Interior; that after getting into the Department, and on account of a rule in the Treasury Board, he could only receive \$400; that the difference had been made up to him by extra work done by himself and the cheques issued in the maiden name of his mother. He told me that Mr. Douglas had done that for him, and he said that he had been sent to me to continue the practice.

1066. Who did he say sent him to you?—I knew that the practice was wrong, and I refused to have anything to do with it; but having found that his story was

correct, I did it, and continued doing it. I continued doing it for three or four months, and then I told him this matter must be fixed, and that I would have nothing more to do with it. Finally, I called him into my room and told him that if he had not political friends to make this matter right I had, and I would see them. He asked me to speak to them, and I spoke to one of them, and he was voted his salary in Parliament.

1067. Who spoke to you?—I knew it was wrong—that it was wrong with the strict construction placed upon the Act, and I accept the full blame.

1068. When you refused to do this, and wanted authority, whom did you get authority from?—I spoke both to Mr. Burgess and to Mr. Hall about the matter. They said it was all right, and what I understand was this: that any payments allowed by either Mr. Hall or Mr. Burgess were as salary. I think myself it was salary. That is my own opinion, that it is not fixed what the working day is—that it is not fixed when a man shall be brought back and when not. I may say, as a permanent official of that Department, I have come back myself for five or six years, and I have worked in that Department for between eight hundred and a thousand nights. I have left Mr. Burgess working there occasionally until twelve and one o'clock; I have seen him working there with Mr. Chisholm, and I have seen Mr. Chisholm ill over it. We used to bring back juniors and extra clerks. Who told them to come back I do not know. These extra clerks we could allow 50 cents an hour, but the junior clerks we could not allow one cent. The result was that they continually worried Mr. Hall and the Deputy of the Department for extra pay, and in a moment of weakness he allowed it. This is all there is in this thing, except the acknowledgment that certain permanent officials, getting good salaries—more than twice as much as some of us, who are working our ears off—and sharing the extra payments of these unfortunate men, who are telling all they know. I know one man who came to me and spoke to me nearly out of his mind. He was dismissed once on my recommendation, because I thought he was a poor clerk. He came back afterwards on the influence of Mr. McMaster, and he came to me at the first meeting in this room. I refused to listen to his case. I said: "Tell the whole truth; tell all you know; what makes you ask?" He told me that Frank Nelson did not want him to tell the truth.

1069. Did he say that he had been approached by Frank Nelson?—He said that Frank Nelson told him to say that he had spent the money for hotel bills. I do not know if that is true. I stopped him.

1070. What kind of a man is this McCabe? Is he reliable?—I cannot tell you that. He knew I had recommended his dismissal to the Deputy, and afterwards I spoke to him about it, and said that since I knew he was doing better work I was sorry I had put him under that reflection.

1071. You know nothing against the man's character?—I know nothing whatever against McCabe, except that he is uncertain.

1072. Uncertain in his work?—I know nothing about his work.

1073. Uncertain in what?—He has been worried about men coming to him to cover up things that there was no necessity to cover up.

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

1074. Do you consider there is nothing at all to cover up in the practice of entering in the Public Accounts statements of account and moneys paid to people who have not done the work?—Certainly, or I would not have refused continuing to certify their accounts; but as far as I know, every dollar's worth of work certified in that Department has been done.

By Mr. Somerville :

1075. Some of the witnesses who have been here say differently. Mr. McCabe swore, that accounts had been certified for work which had never been performed?—I am speaking of my own knowledge; I know nothing about that class of work, except what I have heard.

1076. Do you know Mrs. E. Shore?—I do not know her.

1077. Did you ever certify to any accounts in her name?—I cannot tell until I have seen them. Hundreds of accounts were brought to me to certify, and I paid no attention to the name, provided the files were all right.

1078. You would not remember Miss E. Berry?—No; I do not know what that name is. I may say that possibly I know only a few of those accounts, because you must understand that permanent officials came to me, knowing I had control of the returns to Parliament, and if they presented their accounts I simply saw that the work was done and certified the account.

By Mr. Devlin :

1079. How long is it since you recommended the dismissal of McCabe?—He had been in the Department for about a year; I suppose it is five or six years ago.

1080. Since then you have known nothing against him?—No. I may say, however, that with the exception of nodding to him and saying I was sorry I was so harsh to him, I have not spoken to him since. He might speak to me out in the corridor or on the street, and that's all.

1081. He is an able and reliable man?—Yes.

1082. Are you aware that he was highly recommended to the Department?—

By yourself?

1083. Oh, no. I do not even know him?—I was told he was highly recommended to the Department.

By Mr. Somerville :

1084. Do you remember Turner presenting his account and your refusing to certify it?—I do. I certified some accounts in the name of Slighter. Very often I gave him special work in connection with returns to Parliament. I had an extra clerk named Deacon, and when a certain return was required by Parliament involving carefully prepared statements I gave a portion to Deacon by Mr. Burgess' direction, and the other portion to Turner. I first went to Mr. Turner, as he was working very hard, and asked him how much he could do. He took the half of it, and I gave him some more sheets and the balance to Deacon. Afterwards Mr. Douglas told me that Mr. Turner was dissatisfied, and I then discovered that Mr. Turner was getting extra pay in the name of Mrs. Turner?

1085. At the same time?—I could not tell you if it was the same time. I may have certified to some further accounts after that, but after this came to my knowledge I refused to certify any more.

1086. Were you instructed by any officer in the Department to continue to certify accounts?—No; it is just the general way of doing the work.

By Mr. Foster :

1087. You spoke about a view you had about that section of the Civil Service Act. Will you explain what it is?—Certainly. There is nothing to show what the working out of the Civil Service Act is. There is an Order in Council in existence, and I believe a ruling of the Treasury Board, which authorizes a Deputy Minister to bring back any official he likes. As far as my memory goes, I do not think it says he shall pay them or shall not. I want to say something else, if you will permit me. Mr. Nelson, the other day, when before the Committee, stated in his evidence that he had heard that somebody had said he was going for him. I do not say I go for anybody without cause. I was the man who said that. When I heard him sneering at Mr. Henry for giving away this thing, as they stated, and acting like that, I did say things about him and another that were perhaps hasty, but there was some justification for it. These men had been behind the Deputy Minister; they had been fed by him, he had given them lots of work, while other men doing more responsible work were getting nothing, except in the proper way, and I felt very much hurt that this reflection should have been brought on the whole Department by a few; because I will say this, that there are in that Department 50 or 60 gentlemen with whom

am proud to work. I therefore said I would give it to Nelson if I got the chance. I wish my statement to be scattered as broadcast as his was scattered. The man who will come here and deliberately say that he is getting extra work, that he is a prominent officer of the Department, and mixes himself up with men in the Department who are doing work with which his cannot be compared, who admits that he has taken advantage of his Deputy Minister, and that he has taken money from an unfortunate Civil Service employé, who is getting only \$400 or \$500 a year, deserves all I said of him, and I would like to say more and do more. I would rather be Mr. Harry Palmer, or any other man who started this thing, than Mr. Frank Nelson, to day.

Mr. PALMER.—I beg your pardon ; I did not start this thing.

Mr. ROTHWELL.—I did not say you did, but you have been blackened and made a scapegoat in connection with this matter.

By Mr. Taylor :

1088. You state that an Order in Council exists by which the Deputy Minister can call back any official of the Department?—He can call back any official in the Department, high or low. Some of the Civil Servants do as they are told ; others, perhaps, do not do everything ; and if I have done anything wrong I take the responsibilities on my own shoulders.

1089. Does the Civil Service Act make provision, in case a Deputy Minister orders back a permanent clerk to do work, by which he can be paid?—That depends altogether upon the construction of the Act. I will not undertake to interpret it ; others can do with that.

By Mr. Lister :

1090. I understood you to say you never received any extra pay yourself?—Not one dollar. That brings a matter to my mind which I will frankly state to the Committee. It is one of the things which has perhaps made me feel indignant at somebody who said I was as bad a man as any of the rest of them. There is a small account in the Auditor General's Report which gives the whole thing away. That account is in the name of Mrs. T. M. Rothwell ; that is the name of my wife. I have the good fortune or the bad fortune to have a wife who has a better head than myself. Mr. Burgess, in 1890, told me to go to Banff on important business. My salary is \$1,450 a year, and although I have not a very large family I hesitated, and he asked me "what was the matter." I said "I do not want to go without my wife," and he said, "Take her along." I said, "I cannot on the pittance allowed by the Civil Service Act, \$3.50 a day. I would have to stop at the Canadian Pacific Railway hotel, and the fare is considerable." I afterwards said to Mr. Burgess. "Supposing Mrs. Rothwell does some extra work," and he kindly gave me \$100 worth of work for her. I took the work and she did some 40 odd dollars worth herself. She did it herself ; the cheque was made out in her own name and she got the money. When I came back : as the money did not come up to the \$100, I paid back the difference. I paid over \$60 on account of personal expenses.

JOHN A. HICKEY called, sworn and examined :—

By the Chairman :

1091. Your name is John A. Hickey?—Yes, sir ; Mr. Palmer stated here now in his evidence that I had used threats when we were notified to leave the Department. I would explain how the matter occurred.

Mr. LISTER.—I think Mr. Somerville had better go on with the examination, and let any explanations you have to make come after the evidence.

WITNESS.—I thought you would be kind enough to allow it, as Mr. Palmer was granted the privilege. The occasion I refer to was after being notified by the

Department our services were dispensed with on the 30th of June. Well, a few of us met together, and we were discussing the matter. Of course, most of those present felt naturally annoyed, I thought, on being dismissed so summarily, and I said if I was not satisfied that there was absolute necessity for being dismissed at the time I might be inclined to go for the Department, or to give them a raking through the press on account of it; but being afterwards satisfied, I took no action and done nothing. On the contrary, when Mr. Palmer was dismissed I endeavoured to keep him as quiet as possible; and Mr. Henry is here, he can testify to that. I went on two occasions in order to intercede with the Deputy Minister to get him back, because I apprehended trouble, as he had threatened trouble if he was not taken back, and Mr. Henry seemed inclined to act; but on further consideration he declined. He said he did not like to interfere in the matter, so Mr. Palmer then stated to me he was prepared to give any explanation or any denial, or sign any document, provided he would be taken back. Now, that is true, gentlemen, with regard to the whole matter. Instead of encouraging him to go on, I done all I could to dissuade him.

By Mr. Somerville:

1092. Why did you dissuade him to go on?—Because I did not consider it would do any good, but only give a lot of trouble.
1093. To whom?—To everyone of the Departments and everyone concerned.
1094. How many in the Department did you consider were concerned?—The whole Department.
1095. The whole house? But whom do you consider was implicated? Was the Minister implicated?—No; I don't say anyone was implicated, but I say all this confusion has been made by his dismissal, as far as I know.
1096. What position did you hold in the Department? Are you there now?—I am not.
1097. How long had you been in the service?—Over seven years.
1098. And when were you dismissed?—I was dismissed on the 30th June.
1099. You were an extra clerk?—Yes.
1100. I see in the Auditor General's Report for last year that you were paid for 365 days at \$1.50 a day, and that for extra work you are down for 376 hours at 50 cents an hour,—that would be \$188.00 Did you get all that money?—No.
1101. You did not?—The gentleman who was working with me.
1102. Who was the gentleman working with you?—It was not always the same party. Sometimes it would be a different clerk. I was acting under the instructions of Mr. Henry.
1103. How much of the \$188 did you get for yourself?—As far as I remember I don't think I got more than half that amount.
1104. About \$74?—Yes.
1105. But cannot you be positive?—As far as I remember. It is sometime since, you know.
1106. Did you get the cheque signed?—The cheque came out in my name; I gave half the amount to the party who was working with me.
1107. Did you draw the money yourself?—I did.
1108. Who did you give the money to?—I gave it to the party who had the cheque.
1109. Who was the party?—There was Mr. Connolly, I worked most of the time with. I worked also with others.
1110. What is he?—He is a permanent clerk. I don't know whether he was a permanent clerk myself at that time.
1111. How much did you give to Mr. Connolly?—Well I don't remember precisely.
1112. Who else did you divide with?—I don't well remember, there were so many of us.
1113. This one single transaction?—The reason I remember is, I was more with him than any one else.

1114. This is a single transaction. Surely you can remember whom you shared the money with?—I don't think it was the same person. They were all charged to me.

1115. But when you drew your money out of the bank you knew how much you put in your own cheque, did you not?—I did.

1116. And you knew who you gave the rest to?—As far as I know, Mr. Connolly is the only person I gave to.

1117. You shared with Mr. Connolly the whole of the \$188—he got the rest of it?—I would not say he got the whole of it.

1118. The whole of the rest?—I would not say he got the whole of the rest, but I know he got the greatest portion of it.

By the Chairman :

1119. You say you divided the money with some other clerks. Surely you can give us their names?—I don't remember any other person but Mr. Connolly, he was the one I worked principally with.

By Mr. Somerville :

1120. What others did you work with?—I remember I worked with Mr. Curley; he was an extra clerk.

1121. And he would not get any of it?—Of course; he would get half.

1122. Not with your cheque; he had a cheque of his own?—Yes.

1123. Who did you work with besides Mr. Connolly?—Well, I didn't pay particular attention at the time.

1124. You must remember who you worked with?—Well, Mr. Connolly was the principal person; of course, I worked with Mr. Curley, now I remember. Those are the only two I remember.

1125. Was Mr. Curley a permanent clerk?—No; he is an extra clerk.

1126. You did not share with Mr. Curley? What permanent clerk did you work with?—I happened this way: That Mr. Curley was away, and when he returned we worked together.

1127. I am not speaking of extra clerks, I am speaking of permanent clerks. What other permanent clerks did you work with?—I don't remember any other.

1128. At all events, you only got \$74 of this amount?—Yes.

1129. How long have you been in the Department?—Over seven years.

1130. And you have been in the habit of earning this money in this way previously?—I never received a cent of extra money in that seven years only this, and I would not have received it only for a friend of mine who is down stairs in Mr. Henry's office. It appears Mr. Henry always considered the work would be better done by permanent clerks. It was a particular kind of work, and could only be done by experts, who were familiar with the work. It was most intricate and particular work; and I may say here that this work, although done by permanent clerks, if extra had been called in it would have involved three times the expense, and it would have taken a certain time to train them.

1131. That is your opinion. Are you a competent judge?—Mr. Henry is here, he can testify to that. It would cost the Department three times the amount.

By Mr. Lister :

1132. You had made up your mind at this little meeting, you and a few of your friends, to invoke the power of the press against this?—No; I said if I was not satisfied that it was necessary to dismiss us I might be inclined to do so. Being afterwards satisfied it was, we did not do so. The Deputy Minister afterwards explained at a meeting downstairs, and fully satisfied me we had no reason to do so, and therefore I would not take any action. Or I never wrote a scroll.

1133. Then it was on account of finding out there was no substantial reason that you changed your mind from resenting it?—I merely felt annoyed at the time, as any one would under the circumstances.

1134. And you were going into the press?—I would afterwards, if I had been treated unjustly.

1135. You found out afterwards that you had been treated justly?—I did.

1136. Did you communicate that to the Minister?—I had no communication with the Deputy, or any other person whatever.

1137. It was a fearful threat to make. How many were you?—I think there were fourteen or fifteen of us.

1138. You were to do the writing, were you?—I would have done the writing myself. I considered I would be justified in doing it.

1139. What were you going to write about?—I thought it was a piece of unnecessary tyranny to send so many men adrift, and these men, a great many of them, were unfitted for other callings, and I thought it was very hard to be summarily dismissed.

1140. You considered it was a fearful piece of tyranny?—I considered if it was unnecessary it would be tyranny.

1141. You were going to abandon the Government for doing it?—I don't know it would affect the stability of the Government, but at all events it would have satisfied my feeling?

1142. You were going to abandon the Government, eh?—I don't know that it would seriously affect the Government, but it would have relieved my feelings, any way.

1143. Well, now, you were going to attack them, I suppose?—Well I would consider I would have perfect right; this is a free country.

1144. Were you going to attack them on the ground of this distribution of extra pay?—No; not on that account.

1145. You swear that was not in your mind?—No.

1146. It was not to show the Department up?—No; nothing whatever of that kind.

1147. Nothing more than they were acting tyrannically with a few of your own friends?—I thought they were acting summarily in dismissing us.

1148. You had no intention whatever of showing improper practices prevailing in the Department? You would not do it?—I would not, and I done all I could to restrain Palmer from doing it.

By Mr. Somerville:

1149. Why have you changed your mind?—Because, as I said before, I was satisfied with a proper dismissal.

By Mr. Lister:

1150. Now, have you seen your friends—the gentlemen who met in that room?—I meet them occasionally.

1151. Every day?—Not every day.

1152. Are you going back?—I don't know that. Mr. Palmer drew up a petition, but I wanted to do it in a legal and constitutional way and I drew up a petition myself, and we decided to give it to Mr. Pereira to put it into typewriting.

1153. You drafted it?—I drafted it.

1154. You were afraid Palmer's constitutional knowledge was not sufficient to undertake that part of the work?—Well, yes.

1155. Was Palmer present when you drafted it?—He was.

1156. It was a joint work?—I done the principal portion of it myself. There may have been some alterations made in it. I just done it hastily, in a few minutes.

1157. You have been there for seven years, and you swear that only on one occasion was there a cheque made out to you, the proceeds of which were divided with a permanent clerk?—As far as I remember.

1158. Do you swear that?—I do swear that, as far as I remember.

1159. Only on one occasion?—There may have been more; but I said before that there may have been more.

1160. Do you undertake now to swear that there were no more cases?—I will not; I will not swear to anything but what I know to be true.

1161. And you do not know that?—I do not.

1162. Who did you divide up with?—with Connolly?—Connolly and Curley.

1163. Why did you divide with Curley?—He worked with me.

1164. He was an extra clerk?—As I said before, we should have worked, I think, together. That was how the matter occurred. I remember we worked together, but I forget the details.

By Mr. Bowell :

1165. I understood you to say that you divided with Mr. Curley because you worked on a certain piece of work together and put in one account, which you divided?—Mr. Curley put in a cheque at one time for me and then I put in a cheque for him.

1166. You were both extra clerks?—Yes.

By Mr. Lister :

1167. Why should he put in an account for you?—Because at the time it was put in it was arranged that we took work alternately, week about. That is, when we extra employés worked. We averaged about twenty hours a week.

1168. Then you would have two weeks in one cheque?—No. The amount of his week's work of ten hours at 50 cents would be \$5, and my work at \$5 would be \$10. We would make the cheque out for two weeks.

1169. You could have put your own account in?—Yes.

1170. And he could have put his in?—Yes; but it would only be a small matter of a few dollars. I am prepared to say the work was faithfully and honestly done.

1171. Mr. Connolly was a permanent clerk?—He was latterly.

1172. And he was at the time the cheque was made out to you?—He was part of the time, but I do not think he was a permanent clerk for the whole of the time.

1173. Was he a permanent clerk at the time the services were rendered for which you got a cheque?—As I said, he was for the most of the time; but I think there was a portion of the time he was not.

1174. Was there any portion of it earned while he was a permanent clerk?—There was.

1175. Was he the only permanent clerk you divided with?—There may have been others, but he is the principal one I recollect.

1176. Was that last year?—Last year.

1177. You swear that you have no recollection of dividing up with permanent clerks previous to last year?—No.

1178. And that you never earned any extra pay yourself?—No; only on that occasion.

1179. Did you ever act as a convenience for some permanent clerk who had done work—to have a cheque made out in your name and go and draw the money and give it to him, you doing none of the work yourself?—I may have done it, but I do not remember.

1180. Do you swear you do not remember?—I do not remember. I remember one occasion I was approached to do it, but I did not.

1181. Was that lately?—It was about the last time we went to work there.

1182. Do you tell the Committee here that you never allowed your name to be used for the purpose of drawing money for permanent clerks?—As far as my memory goes, I do not remember it. I remember distinctly that I refused when asked, although I was conscious he did the work, and that it would be certified to by Mr. Henry.

1183. Did you, during the time this conspiracy was hatched up?—There was no conspiracy.

1184. Conference would be the better word. Did you tell your friends, at the time you held the conference, that you had received cheques for permanent clerks?—I do not remember.

1185. Will you swear you did not?—I may have said something of the kind, but I do not remember it.

1186. What is your present employment,—in the Civil Service?—Not at present.

1187. Do you expect to receive employment?—No; not from any Government sources. I had been acting as insurance agent, and I have been a notary by profession.

1188. In Quebec?—Yes.

1189. You have been in expectation of receiving employment again?—There has been no promise made to me.

1190. Did you ask?—No; but when I was dismissed I applied to some of my friends—it is not necessary to mention the gentleman's names. I certainly tried to get back again, but I found it was useless.

By Mr. Taylor :

1191. You made the statement here a few moments ago that all the employés drew money in this way. What did you refer to,—all the employés in your room or in the whole Department?—I did not say that.

1192. That was the interpretation I put upon it, that all the employés of the Department earned it in this way?—I did not say it. In fact, I got no extra work there myself except that year, although I had been seven years there. On one occasion when I had been burned out here I applied for extra work and could not get it. The Deputy told me that this extra work was only given to orphans and widows, and persons in very distressed circumstances.

By Mr. Lister :

1193. You do not recollect being offered money for your name?—No. If it had been offered I would not have taken it.

By the Chairman :

1194. This work was faithfully performed that you spoke about as having been done by Mr. Connolly?—It was earned faithfully.

By Mr. Denison :

1195. How many years were you engaged on the press?—It was up the country. It was not a journal of great importance. It was a paper conducted by Dr. Shannon. It was the Eganville *Enterprise*.

Mr. T. G. ROTHWELL recalled and further examined:—

By Mr. Taylor :

1196. I wish to ask if all the accounts you certified to were for work actually done and the money earned?—Yes. I forgot to say that in the case I mentioned of Mr. Rowatt I told him he would have to do the work again before I would certify it, and he actually worked two hours for every one he was paid.

L. C. PEREIRA called, sworn and examined:—

By Mr. Somerville :

1197. What position do you occupy in the Department?—Assistant Secretary of the Department.

1198. How long have you been in the Department?—Since the 1st of January, 1883.

1199. What salary do you get?—\$1,800.

1200. Is that the whole salary you get?—That is the whole salary I am drawing to-day.

1201. How is that money paid?—That is my permanent salary.

1202. You are acting as Private Secretary?—I was.

1203. But not now?—No.

1204. When did that salary cease?—30th June last.

1205. Who is Private Secretary now?—I do not know.

1206. How long did you occupy the position of Private Secretary?—I have been Private Secretary under different Ministers.

1207. Can you remember when you were appointed?—I came up first as Private Secretary to Sir David Macpherson.

1208. Were you filling another appointment in the service?—I was a second class clerk in the service.

1209. I am informed that you have been in the habit of drawing money other than your salary from the Department. Is that the case?—I have.

1210. In your name, or in what other names have you drawn money?—In the name of Lizzie Evans.

1211. Any others?—Ellen Berry.

1212. Any others?—No.

1213. Just those two?—Yes.

1214. You know Lucy Evans?—No.

1215. Did you ever draw any money in the name of Lucy Evans?—No.

1216. Where does Lizzie Evans live?—She is my wife.

1217. Who is Miss Berry. Not your wife, too?—That is an assumed name.

1218. There is no such person?—No.

1219. How did you come to make out an account in Ellen Berry's name?—I would like to make some statement to the Committee.

1220. Answer the question first and make some statement afterwards. Very well, then you may make your statement?—After the session, at the time of the North-West Rebellion, the two private secretaries of the Minister of Militia had a grant of \$500 each for extra work, which was entailed upon them by the occurrence of the North-West Rebellion. The late Minister of the Interior, the Hon. Thomas White—who was subsequently made Minister—was asked on my behalf if a similar compensation would be made to me, because it was represented to him that I had certainly done as much work as either of these two other secretaries, if not more. My Minister said at the time, that he did not care to ask anything for his own private secretary, as it would seem too much like a personal favour. He subsequently, as I was informed by my Deputy Minister, authorized that a certain amount of work should be given to my wife in compensation for the extra services I had rendered, instead of asking for a grant for me. This extra work the Deputy Minister allowed my wife to do from time to time as it could be found, and there was an amount paid up to about \$280 in that name.

1221. In which name?—Lizzie Evans. I may explain to the Committee, that Evans is my wife's maiden name. The work up to about \$280, I think—

1222. What year was that in?—That was up to the year ending 30th June 1887.

1223. How much did you get that year under the name of Lizzie Evans?—\$280. In the spring of last year, 1890, I was very much pressed with work, and I had made application to the Deputy Minister for some sort of assistance, and I reminded him that my wife had not got the benefit of the whole of what the late Minister had sanctioned to be given to her on my behalf, and he authorized me to allow her to help me in my work to the extent of a further amount which would about cover what the late Minister had sanctioned.

1224. How much did he sanction?—He sanctioned at least \$400, I know.

1225. A year?—No, for the whole thing; and I am not sure that he did not say that it might be extended to \$600; but I have nothing to show for that and I am not certain.

1226. Have you anything to show for the \$400?—The work that was done in the spring of 1890, was done during April and May, and the account for it would have been made out in my wife's maiden name in the same manner.

1227. Ellen Berry?—No; Lizzie Evans. I had incidentally heard some talk about extra work, and had heard it mentioned in a peculiar way: "We know who this man is and that man, and we know who Lizzie Evans is." I took upon myself the responsibility, of which this Committee will be the judge, of not allowing my wife's name to appear any longer in the matter, and the account I made out myself in Ellen Berry's name. When the cheque was made out, I endorsed that cheque. There is no such person as Ellen Berry. The work was done by my wife and I took the responsibility of making the account out and the cheque in that other name for the reason which I have explained.

By Mr. Lister:

1228. You state that the Minister authorized you to do the extra work?—Yes.

1229. That was for the balance between the \$280 and the \$400?—No. The Deputy Minister authorized the balance of the work on the authority which he had previously received from the late Minister. I would like to add to my statement that with regard to the sanction given by the late Minister for the work to be given to my wife, I have the authority of the member for Cardwell, for making that statement to the Committee.

By Mr. Somerville:

1230. When you had this work given to your wife, why did you call her "Miss Lizzie Evans?" What was that done for?—I did not think it was desirable to make it public in any way that my wife was getting the work.

1231. For what reason did you not, if it was honestly earned? Why did you object?—For one reason I suppose that if it were known, very likely a number of other permanent clerks might ask for the same thing.

1232. You state that the late Minister authorized you to get up to \$400?—Yes, up to \$400; but I am not certain that he did not say it might go up to \$600. I may state that, because I have a note with me as to that.

1233. Whom did you get the information from that you were to be allowed to go up to \$600?—The Deputy Minister said that he thought that that authority had been given. He was not quite positive on the point, but he was certainly positive about the amount of \$400.

1234. How did you come to draw more than \$400?—I did it under the authority of the Deputy Minister, because he was under the impression, and I have no doubt he had good grounds for having that impression, that the Minister had said it might go up to \$600.

1235. You were more interested in this than the Deputy Minister, but your impression was that it was \$400?—No, Sir; what I said was that I knew that I had something to show it was up to \$400, but beyond that I had nothing except the impression, but what I received from the Deputy Minister.

1236. Who was present beside the Minister and yourself when this understanding was come to?—Nobody else was present.

1237. Was the Deputy Minister not present?—I presume the Deputy Minister had an interview with the Minister because he conveyed the information to me.

1238. After you had had a consultation with the Minister?—I had had several consultations with the Minister about it.

By Mr. Haggart:

1239. I understood you to say that you had something to show that that arrangement was made. What do you mean by that. Have you anything in writing respecting that \$400?—I have shown the member for Cardwell confidential correspondence with the late Minister's brother which I think will satisfy him that it bears out my statement.

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—I think that correspondence should be produced, Mr. Chairman.

WITNESS—If the member for Cardwell has no objections I have no objections. It was a letter written by the late Minister to his brother at the time the arrangement was made. He was helping me financially and the money was paid to him out of this extra money.

By Mr. Somerville :

1240. Repaid to whom?—To Mr. Richard White, of Montreal.

1241. Then you were in financial difficulties?—I had borrowed some money from him.

By the Chairman :

1242. Is this letter in your possession now?—The correspondence is in the possession of the Deputy Minister. It is a letter in his private letter book. I have a copy of it.

MR. R. S. WHITE, M.P.—Perhaps I may be allowed to say that I knew nothing of the existence of this letter until yesterday, when in the course of conversation with me, Mr. Pereira showed me this letter written by Mr. Burgess to Mr. Richard White of Montreal. Of the statements in that letter, I have no doubt as to their truth, but I never saw the letter or knew it was in existence until yesterday. I am not in a position to authorize Mr. Pereira to produce it, but I am satisfied Mr. Burgess' statements contained in it are correct.

1243. MR. SOMERVILLE (to witness). You have a copy of that letter in your possession?—Yes.

1244. You have it with you?—Yes.

MR. SOMERVILLE.—I think we ought to have the copy of that letter produced.

After some discussion upon the point the Chairman ruled that the Committee had no authority to compel the witness to produce this copy of the letter, but that Mr. Burgess could produce it if he cared to do so.

WITNESS—If the Committee will allow me I might say that the letter contains other personal matters which have no bearing whatever on the subject-matter of the conversation.

By Mr. Somerville :

1245. When did you first commence drawing any extra money in your wife's name or in anyone else's name?—I had drawn money in her name for work that she had done previously to this.

1246. What time did you commence to draw that?—I have no note of that. I have no doubt the Auditor General's Report will show.

1247. Did you draw any in 1883-84?—I cannot say. I have not made an examination of the Auditor's Report to see.

1248. But you certainly could remember the year in which you commenced to draw this extra money?—I cannot say without referring to the Auditor's Report.

1249. But you did draw moneys before the arrangement was made with the late Minister which you have spoken of?—Yes, there have been amounts drawn.

1250. In the name of your wife?—Yes.

1251. And in the name of anyone else?—In the name of Ellen Berry, as I stated. In the spring of 1890.

By Mr. Lister :

1252. Is that the first time Ellen Berry's name appeared in 1890?—Yes.

1253. Previously to that time, in whose name were the cheques made?—In Lizzie Evans' name.

1254-5. And only in her name?—Yes.

1256. For what services were the payments previous to the arrangement made by the late Minister?—They were all made for extra work.

By Mr. Somerville :

1257. According to the Auditor General's Report for 1883-84, I see, "Miss Lizzie Evans, \$120.20." You got that money?—No doubt I did.

1258. By whose authority did you get that work?—Of course, I got it by the authority of the Deputy Minister.

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

1259. Were you not aware that it was contrary to the Civil Service Act to receive pay for work done in that way?—I do not know that I was. I do not think that I had ever looked at the Civil Service Act at that time.

1260. You took an oath when you entered the Service?—I did not take an oath when I entered the Service, and I do not think I did until quite recently.

1261. This was merely a subterfuge on your part?—I want the Committee to understand that my wife did that work; and as to what the late Minister authorized, he authorized it as compensation for the extra labour performed during the session when the work of the Rebellion was on the Department, and that the work had actually to be done over twice so that it might be really her own.

1262. But with respect to the previous payments?—That was for extra work done by my wife.

By Mr. Chapleau :

1263. You were compensated for extra work you had done?—Yes.

1264. And to compensate you for the extra work you had done your wife had to do that extra work?—Quite so.

1265. You certified to your wife's accounts?—I did in one case—certainly.

1266. When she did the work?—In the case of Ellen Berry I did.

By Mr. Hyman :

1267. Did Ellen Berry do the work?—No; the work was done by my wife. Ellen Berry represented my wife.

By Mr. Somerville :

1268. What I understand you is, that this work done in the name of Ellen Berry, was done by your wife?—Yes.

1269. And when she did the work you certified the account was correct?—I did in the case of Ellen Berry.

1270. In every instance?—No; in no other instance.

1271. Only the payments to Ellen Berry?—Yes; just the two.

1272. Who had the checking of the work?—I checked the work myself, because I was the only person who knew what had been done.

1273. Did not you submit that to your superior?—As a matter of fact there was nobody to submit work of that kind to.

1274. Who knew in the Department that you were certifying to your wife's work?—I did not know if the Deputy Minister knew I certified these particular accounts.

1275. Who sent the work to your wife?—I took the work to my wife myself. I may say to the Committee that there is not one night in the month for all the years I have worked here—and I was appointed in 1883—that I have not taken work home myself, altogether irrespective of that which my wife did.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant) :

1276. Did you select the work, or did your superior officer select it?—I selected the work.

By Mr. Somerville :

1277. You selected the work, took it home, and afterwards when it was done, you certified to the account in this fictitious name?—Yes.

By Mr. Foster :

1278. For all that work, whether before this arrangement with the Minister, or after, which has been done, and paid for, either in the name of Lizzie Evans or Ellen Berry, the actual work was done by your wife?—The actual work was done in every case.

1279. And certified to by you?—Certified by me in some cases.

1280. And in other cases?—In other cases the work was done.

1281. It was work necessary for the Department?—Yes; it helped me and saved me a good deal of my time. It would have necessitated employing an assistant for me if it had not been given to my wife in that way.

By Mr. Foster :

1282. So in no case did you use your wife's name—Ellen Berry's name—as a mere convenience to draw sums for yourself?—No—never.

By Mr. Chapleau :

1283. There was no fictitious account?—There were no fictitious accounts.

By Mr. Lister :

1284. You said you took work home and your wife and yourself did it?—Yes.

1285. That is so, is it?—Yes.

1286. I don't care how much your wife and you did, but the work was done between you?—The work was done.

1287. The account was made out in her name and certified to by you?—In some cases.

1288. In the two cases to Ellen Berry?—Yes.

1289. Part of that money was for work that had been done by you?—The whole of it was work done by my wife.

1290. You say you took work home and your wife and you did it?—I always took work home.

1291. Did you do any part of it?—My wife did it.

By Mr. Bowell :

1292. What we want to know is did you do any of the work for which you received money under your wife's name?—What I wish the Committee to understand is this—whatever work was charged for was amply covered by the work done by my wife.

By Mr. Lister :

1293. Supposing you took \$100 worth of work home, did you and your wife work on that together?—Whatever she would have done would have amounted to the value of \$100.

1294. And it was for that account only?—For that account only.

1295. And there was no part of your work included in the accounts of Ellen Berry?—Not at all.

1296. You did none of that work yourself?—None. That was all work she did for me.

1297. Then I understand you did none of the work at all?—No.

1298. And the bills made out to Ellen Berry were for work done by your wife?—Yes.

1299. None of which you did?—None of which I did.

1300. Who certified to the accounts made in the name of Lizzie Evans?—I cannot tell, unless I see the accounts. I may have certified to some of them.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.—These accounts are not here.

By Mr. Lister :

1301. You cannot tell. They were certified to, at all events?—Yes.

1302. You may have certified you say to some of them?—I may have done so, but I cannot recollect.

1303. If you did not certify who did?—Some officer in the Department.

By Mr. Bowell :

1304. I understood you to say you take work to do at home for which you make no extra charge?—I have done that until perhaps the beginning of this year every night of my life since I have been here.

By Mr. Somerville :

1305. How many years?—Since 1st January, 1883.

1306. Since 1st January, 1883, up to when?—Up to till towards the spring of this year.

1307. You were so busy in performing departmental work you had to take it home every night?—I would like to say that, perhaps a night or two during the month I might not do so.

1308. What kind of work would this be?—Private secretary's work and departmental work.

1309. That is what I want to get at. I thought if you were so busy doing departmental work at that time you could not do much work as private secretary?—I filled the two positions together. I may say, during the time I was working as private secretary my Minister's system was to take the information from the papers himself in a great measure; and that necessitated his going through all the papers. In almost every case he had to deal with he preferred to do that, and to answer the letters fully himself, according to the facts as they appeared in the correspondence rather than simply to send an acknowledgment and have the bulk of the work done as a departmental matter.

By the Chairman :

1310. That was Mr. White?—Yes, Mr. White, and the previous Minister.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant) :

1311. When did you get that sum of \$400 that has been paid away back in 1882 or 1883?—That sum of \$400 was paid after the North-West Rebellion.

1312. Because some clerks in the Militia Department had got it, you thought you were entitled to it?—Two private secretaries in the Militia Department got \$500 each.

1313. It was thought you should have the same?—My Minister thought I should have got compensation.

1314. What year was that in?—It must have been in 1886.

1315. Was that certified to as work already done, or was there work given?—It was the late Minister who authorized the Deputy Minister to give extra work to my wife as compensation to me for his not being able to ask for a grant for me. The work was all done over again, and, as a matter of fact, in that way the money was really earned twice.

1316. Thus you thought if you were entitled to the first grant it was really imposing upon you to require you to do extra work in order to make payment possible?—I did not think I was imposed upon.

1317. But you thought you were not dealt with as justly as the others?—I thought I was as much entitled to it as the other secretaries were.

1318. And the Minister agreed to that?—Yes; he agreed, and stipulated I should do the work over again, and he explained his reasons for not asking for a grant, which was it was like asking a personal favour for himself if he asked it for his private secretary.

By Mr. Foster :

1319. So your compensation was really a privilege to your wife to earn \$400, which she did?—Yes.

By Mr. Hyman :

1320. You had taken that privilege before this. What was the object in asking the Minister to do it again?—No; I was never in a position to give out work myself.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant) :

1321. Who selected the work that your wife did for the \$400, did you select that yourself?—Yes.

1322. Did any other officer know the amount she was doing?—They may have, some of them.

1323. But it was under your charge?—Yes, under my charge.

By Mr. Lister :

1324. The first work done in 1883 was done by your wife?—Yes.

1325. And it was selected by you?—It may have been selected by me.

1326. What about that cheque in 1883, that was to Lizzie Evans?—Yes.

By Mr. Somerville :

1327. You thought you were insufficiently paid, Mr. Pereira?—I thought I had done a great deal of extra work which my salary did not cover, during the two sessions of the Rebellion, and in view of the grant that had been made to the two private secretaries of one single Minister I thought, and I had every reason to suppose, my Minister concurred in my view of the case.

By Mr. Lister :

1328. All this money I think you said went to Mr. Richard White?—No, sir, not all of it.

1329. The greater part of it, then? I cannot tell you for a moment how much of it; but when he knew this arrangement had been made, he was kind enough to help me through by an advance, and it was paid by cash.

1330. When he knew you had made this arrangement with the Minister he advanced you money, and he was repaid out of the proceeds of this work done?—Mr. Richard White did. He was in constant communication with his brother and would not have made the advance to me if the arrangement had not been made. I don't know if I did before, but I would like to make it quite plain, that the Deputy Minister although he had authorised the work in the spring of 1890, that my wife should get the work, he did not know—and I don't know that he knows until I appeared before the Committee this morning—that the account was made out in any different name than my wife's. I took the full responsibility of doing that, and he did not know that I had used any other name than my wife's maiden name.

By Mr. Somerville :

1331. Did you ever receive any portion of the cheque made payable to Mr. Humphreys?—Never.

1332. Are you sure of that?—I am quite sure. As Mr. Humphreys name has been mentioned I certified to an account for Humphreys, I may say for extra work and the reason why I did so was because he informed me Mr. Henry had refused to certify to it. He did not give me any other reason. He simply asked me if I would certify to it, and I asked him the whole of the circumstances, and reasons why he was getting this work, because it was the first time I knew he was getting it, and I made him explain fully to me what he was doing, and I was aware—as I never left the Department before six o'clock every evening—he was constantly engaged there

doing work after hours, and I satisfied myself he was doing this work, else I should not have certified to the account, but I know I have never received a cent of it and know nothing about it.

1333. That would be this account of Humphreys in 1889-90 for 776 hours at 50 cents would it?—I don't know, I fancy the Committee are under perhaps, a misapprehension about these accounts. Probably that would be made in monthly payments.

1334. Did you ever receive a consideration from a man named Walter Hatch for recommending his annual increase?—No.

1335. You never received any consideration?—No; Mr. Hatch came to me—he had been able to do some departmental work which I had been able to find for him—and he came to me and said that he had not been getting his increase for some years, and asked me if I would recommend him.

By Mr. Foster :

1336. Was he a permanent clerk?—He was a permanent clerk. He had not been doing a very great deal of work in the Department, I thought simply, perhaps, through want of qualification for it to some extent, but I found that I could give him work which he could make himself useful at, and after he had been at it for some time he asked me if, in view of his being able to do some work, I was not able to recommend his application for his ordinary statutory increase. I said if he would put in an application to the Secretary I would state to the Secretary exactly what he was doing. That is what I did.

1337. He had not been receiving his statutory increase for some time?—He had not been receiving his statutory increase for some time.

1338. He has received his statutory increase since he spoke to you?—Yes, all I did was to hand his application over to the Secretary, and I simply stated what I knew to be just to the man, because I knew he was trying to do what he could in his work. I could not do anything else than hand his application over to the Secretary.

1339. Why was he not getting his statutory increase the same as other clerks?—That is not a matter I had anything to do with.

1340. What kind of work does this man Hatch do?—What I give over to Mr. Hatch, as I can find it, is correspondenee. If it is not worrying the Committee, I would like to say what I do is this; to take a fyle and write a letter for him in shorthand. I write it in shorthand myself and send it up to him and he can type-write it from that.

1341. From the shorthand?—Yes. The reason for my work being somewhat lighter now is that I have taught three or four of my shorthand writers to do that, and I can do a great deal of work at night in that way. I write the letters in shorthand and they can read it.

1342. Is that the principal work this man has to do?—That is the principal work he has to do.

1343. What is his grade?—Third class clerk.

1344. Is he employed pretty steadily in doing this work for you?—Yes.

1345. How many hours does he work?—He is there during official hours.

1346. I have been informed he does not do an hour's work a day?—He is not in my room and I am not the head of the Secretary's branch, but as far as I am able I have kept him employed.

1347. Was it your duty to keep him employed?—Yes, as far as I am able.

1348. Was he under you?—He was more immediately under the Secretary of the Department.

1349. If you did not find work for him, was it anybody else's duty to find work for him?—I do not know. That is a matter for the head of the Department to say.

1350. He was supposed to work under your instruction?—Under the instruction of the Secretary. I am only the Assistant Secretary of the Department.

1351. Did the Secretary instruct you that you were to have the services of this man Hatch under your command?—He never instructed me, but looked to me to try and utilize everybody in the Department.

1352. Is it then a fact, that this man Hatch was working under you principally?—Not under me principally.

1353. How much work does Mr. Hatch do for you daily?—I cannot say that.

By Mr. Bowell :

1354. Did you recommend Mr. Hatch's statutory increase to be paid?—When Mr. Hatch put in his application he asked me if I would hand it to the Secretary of the Department, to whom it was addressed, and if I could do so to recommend it.

1355. Did you?—I said I would state exactly what the facts of the case were. I did recommend it.

1356. Did you do that in consideration of being paid by Hatch?—No, sir, I did not.

1357. You did not get anything for that?—No, sir, nothing whatever. I did it simply as a matter of justice to the man.

By Mr. Somerville :

1358. No consideration from the man at all?—No.

By Mr. Bowell :

1359. You borrowed no money from him?—No; I have borrowed no money from Mr. Hatch.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant):

1360. What rule prevails in the Department about certifying to accounts? How many are allowed to certify to accounts?—I do not know that I am quite competent to answer that question.

1361. I understood you to state that Mr. Henry had declined to certify to an account of Mr. Humphreys. Did you say that?—Yes; that was what Mr. Humphreys told me

1362. But it was Mr. Henry's place to certify to that particular account?—I do not know that it was his place. What I understood was that Mr. Henry, would not certify because some of the other men wanted to be paid.

1363. It seems to me a strange thing that he should go to Mr. Henry unless Mr. Henry was the right man to certify. Does the rule of the Department allow that if a superior officer does not certify to an account the clerk may go to some other person and have him certify, and his account will be paid on that certificate?—I think if a permanent clerk in any position in the Department was satisfied that the work he was asked to certify to was done—as in this case I satisfied myself it was—he would have the power to do so.

1364. Any permanent clerk?—I am not in a position to say that.

1365. Is it your belief that any permanent clerk would have the power to certify to an account?—I am not sure about that.

1366. I am only trying to find out the rule of the Department. To this work which Mr. Humphreys brought to you, Mr. Henry had been asked to certify. Why did he go to Mr. Henry first? Did Mr. Henry give out that work to him?—It was extra work on the books.

1367. Who should assist Mr. Humphreys on that?—Mr. Henry, I presume.

1368. Then Mr. Henry surely should have certified to that account that he had authorized. I want to know what rule of the Department permitted him to go to you and how your certificate passed muster. Is every officer who knows nothing about anything to have the power to pass what an officer who does know refuses?—In that case it was the fact. But it was not because I knew nothing about it, I satisfied myself first.

1369. If you had not satisfied yourself, or if it had happened to be somebody else they might have done it too?—I cannot say how other clerks would have acted.

1370. In that case this man was working under Mr. Henry and Mr. Henry declined to certify?—Not because the work was not done.

1371. But he declined to certify?—Yes.

1372. And you knowing nothing of the matter yourself, except when the matter was brought to you, certified?—I think I have stated that from the fact of my being just across the passage—

1373. But your work was entirely different?—Yes.

1374. He came to you with this account, and said: "Mr. Henry will not certify to it." I am not finding fault with you. I want to find out if it was the rule of the Department. You certified to it, first satisfying yourself that the work had been done. Is there any supervision over and above this certificate of permanent clerks as to how this is done, and whether it is to be done under certain jurisdiction. The mere fact of any officer's name being on the account, does that pass muster in the highest quarter? Can any one of you in command supersede any official, although you have not given the work yourselves?—I think they were satisfied the work had been done, and it was not for that reason that the person who gave the work out would not certify. It was simply because Mr. Henry declined to certify, because others would want the same thing.

By Mr. Hyman :

1375. Did you take occasion to ascertain from Mr. Henry why he refused to certify Humphreys' account?—I took Humphreys' word for it.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant) :

1376. When this work was certified to whom did your certificate pass? What official does it then go to?—To the Accountant.

1377. Was it any part of the Accountant's duty to go beyond any officer of the Department in regard to the certifying of accounts, or is that a sufficient authority for him?—I do not know what instructions the Accountant may have.

1378. But in that case there was no inquiry made by the accountant?—No.

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

1379. I understood you to say that you did not go to Mr. Henry, who is an officer of considerable rank in your Department, and ask him why he refused to certify the account. You had no communication with Mr. Henry?—No, sir; partly because I knew this man was working from day to day.

1380. Mr. Humphreys was a temporary clerk?—Yes.

1381. And from what you tell us, it appears the practice of the Department is this—that a temporary clerk comes to you after his superior, Mr. Henry, declines to certify the account and you certify to it?—I certified to it.

1382. Mr. Henry is an independent officer, as far as you are concerned?—Yes.

1383. And you, the Assistant Secretary of the Department, third in command, do not deem it necessary to hold any communication with Mr. Henry as to the reasons for his declining to certify to Humphreys' account?—I did not think it was necessary, because I knew this extra work was being done. I had the evidence of it myself.

1384. As a matter of discipline in the Department, do not you think an officer in your position, when he finds for any reason that an officer of high grade, if not of co-ordinate degree, declines to certify to an account, as a matter of business, that you should have had some communication with Henry about it?—As a matter of business and courtesy, I admit perhaps that I should have done so.

1385. You have already told us you believe Mr. Humphreys?—I knew Humphreys was working there. I think I may say that the Registry branch is in a measure just as much under the control of the Secretary's branch, because the Secretary has

really charge of all the correspondence, and must necessarily, therefore, have charge of all the files—must have access to them, in order to get information.

1386. It might be a different thing if you had consulted with Mr. Henry, and then in the exercise of your discretion, after hearing his decision, you had chosen to over-rule it. That is a thing which may or may not have been done with propriety under a sense of your responsibility. I am putting the question to you, however, whether you, as one of the principal officers of the Department, should not in such circumstances have communicated to Mr. Henry, who was the officer who gave the work to Humphreys?—I have stated already that as a matter of business and courtesy it would have been better, but in this particular case Mr. Humphreys stated the reason why Mr. Henry declined to certify to the account.

1387. You have stated a dozen times that Humphreys gave the reasons, but I do not care a straw for that. The question I put is: whether or not the rules of your Department are so loose and so lax that when an officer of that Department, having given work to a clerk, declines to certify the account, and you certify to it without the common courtesy and business precaution of communicating with the chief who gave the work out?—I think I admitted that I recognized that.

1388. That you had done wrong?—No; not that I had done wrong; but that, as a matter of business courtesy, it would have been better to have asked Mr. Henry about it. I would have done so in any ordinary case, but in this case I knew the work was done.

By Mr. Foster :

1389. Did you do that more than once?—I do not think that I did.

1390. Then, from this one transaction it would not be fair to deduce that this was the general practice in the Department?—Not so far as my experience goes.

By Mr. Lister :

1391. As I understand it, you have permanent clerks and extra clerks in the Department?—Yes.

1392. And the extra clerks are doing work under some of the permanent clerks?—Not necessarily; they are doing work generally.

1393. Supposing you have someone in your office doing work under you, you, as a permanent clerk, would certify to that work?—Certainly.

1394. Does that prevail all through the Department?—I do not know; I am not in a position to know.

1395. Then, what right had you to certify to that account at all?—Because I knew the work had been done.

1396. But not under your instructions?—I knew it was done.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant) :

1397. Are you the superior officer of Mr. Henry?—I do not know; I could not say; but I did not mean, by my certifying to that account, to challenge Mr. Henry's authority in any way.

1398. By your rank, could you over-rule Mr. Henry in any way?—I do not know about that.

By the Chairman :

1399. About this matter of Walter Hatch: there were two statements made by Mr. Somerville. One was that you took money from Hatch to get him an increase in salary. That you have denied upon oath. The second statement is, that Hatch did not do an hour's work every day, and you say you recommended him for a statutory increase. Did you know what work he did, or had you a general idea?—Certainly I did.

1400. Did he do more than an hour's work every day?—Yes.

1401. Two hours?—Yes.

1402. Four hours—did he do a pretty good day's work every day?—I think he did a fair day's work for his ability.

By Mr. Somerville :

1403. For his ability?—Every body has not got the same ability.

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

1404. What time did Mr. Hatch enter the service?—I do not know, sir; he has been there a long time.

1405. Longer than yourself?—I cannot say.

By Mr. Somerville :

1406. You say in your evidence that you used to take work home to your house to do in the evenings, and also work for your wife?—Yes.

1407. You state that you did that nearly every evening?—I said I did my own work myself.

1408. And you worked every evening?—Yes.

1409. Would that be all the year round?—Pretty nearly all year round.

1410. Previous to 1890 were you working at home nearly all the year round?—Yes, except that there might be a few nights that I have not worked at home.

1411. You say you were at home nearly every night in the year, with one or two exceptions?—Yes.

1412. This man Humphreys put in 776 hours at 50 cents an hour. Now, if he was paid for doing work 776 hours at 50 cents, and you were working extra hours at home, how could you be cognizant of the fact that he was working extra hours?—Perhaps you do not remember that the office hours are from 10 to 4. Mr. Humphreys, I know that, for the account I certified was working between 4 and 6.

1413. And you were still in the Department then?—Yes.

1414. Are you aware that in the evidence given by the Deputy Minister before this Committee, Mr. Burgess explained that this man Humphreys was paid this 50 cents as a consideration for his excellent qualities as a clerk, and not for extra work at all?—I know that Mr. Humphreys was an exceedingly good man, and that he was working over hours. I do not know the reasons that may have been given for his getting the extra 50 cents.

MR. BURGESS—The fact is, that in 1887 Mr. Humphreys was paid an extra 50 cents a day because he was a superior clerk to those who were getting \$1.50 a day.

By Mr. Chapleau :

1415. You have mentioned your work outside of this Department. You were a Departmental clerk at the same time that you were Private Secretary?—Yes.

1416. And for the work you did, at home did you receive any consideration?—None at all.

1417. What were your ordinary office hours in the Department?—The official hours were from 10 to 4.

1418. But you were in the Department up to what time?—I never left the Department before 6 and sometimes even 7 o'clock.

1419. Did you receive any remuneration?—Nothing, except this favour I have spoken of.

By Mr. White (Cardwell) :

1420. I desire to understand a little more clearly this arrangement which you say was made with the late Minister. It was for an allowance of \$400?—That was the amount in the aggregate.

1421. And the work was to be performed by Mrs. Pereria, and was to be done over again to be earned?—Yes.

1422. And it was earned over again—every dollar of it?—Yes.

1423. If Mrs. Pereira had not been employed, would some one else have been engaged?—Certainly; a second-class clerk would have been necessary to do the work, and that would have involved an expense of \$1,000 a year.

1424. There was no loss to the Treasury in consequence of this arrangement? Was that arrangement in contravention of the Civil Service Act?—I cannot say that; I am not clever enough to interpret the Civil Service Act.

1425. You say the cheque was made out in the name of Lizzie Evans?—Yes; it was my wife's maiden name.

1426. Had the cheques passed under the notice of the late Minister?—No; I don't think so. After he had given his consent to the arrangement he had nothing further to do with it afterwards.

1427. I understand you said that most of this money, which amounted in the aggregate to \$280—that was the amount earned—and that the whole of this \$280 earned was subsequently paid to Mr. Richard White, of Montreal?—I cannot say how much.

1428. Was the late Minister a party to the arrangement?—Not that I know of at all. It is quite possible he was not. It was an arrangement between myself and Mr. Richard White.

1429. And it was made subsequent to the arrangement that the Minister should give compensation for Mrs. Pereira's work?—It was after Mr. Richard White had given his authority to it.

1430. And who gave the information to Mr. Richard White?—The Deputy Minister did.

1431. Not Mr. Thomas White himself?—No.

By Mr. Hyman :

1432. In regard to that—Humphreys' account of \$200, you spoke of certifying to it?—I did not speak of certifying to it.

1433. What was the amount?—It was probably only a small amount.

1434. What reason did Mr. Humphreys give to you for Mr. Henry not certifying to it?—As far as I recollect, the reason he gave was that Mr. Henry thought if he got extra work or extra pay that others in his room should get it too. Well, I knew of course that was a matter for the Deputy Minister or the Minister. That was nothing to Mr. Henry or myself, and I knew this work was being done by Mr. Humphreys.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant) :

1435. Mr. Henry thought there were others in the room entitled to this work as well as Mr. Humphreys?—That was the reason Mr. Henry gave me.

By Mr. Lister :

1436. You certified to the 766 hours for Mr. Humphreys account?—I don't know that I certified to it. That is an account for the whole year.

1437. This is the aggregate?—Yes; but what I certified to might be only for 50 or 60 hours.

Mr. BURGESS recalled.

By Mr. Foster :

1438. There were some questions as to what was the practice of the Department in this matter of certifying. One case was proved, in which Mr. Pereira certified to an account. In view of that special case, the rule might be deduced from it of considerable looseness. Would you state what is the practice in your Department in reference to certifying and paying accounts?—Only the clerk who is in charge of the room in which the work is performed certifies. Take Mr. Henry, for example.

he is a first-class clerk, drawing the same pay as Mr. Pereira. A certificate from him to me that the work had been performed in his room would be a satisfactory certificate.

By Mr. Hyman :

1439. Can you tell me if this account Mr. Pereira speaks of passed through by this rule?—If it was certified to by Mr. Pereira I would be perfectly satisfied. He is an officer of that standing. His certificate would have to be taken, or the Department could not be run.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant) :

1440. There is no supervision?—Certainly there is a supervision.

1441. Well, why was this rule not adopted?

Mr. FOSTER.—There was no reason to adopt it.

Mr. LISTER.—He said he had the right to certify to it.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant) :

1442. Had he the right to certify to an account with which he had nothing to do?—Both of these gentlemen are in the same branch of the Department. The room in which the one man works is right opposite the other man's room.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.—Yes; but that would not enable a man to see through the wall, or whether the work was done?

The WITNESS.—They are engaged in exactly the same class of work. If Mr. Pereira wanted any papers he either goes or sends into Mr. Henry's room for them, which, as I have said, is opposite, and any explanations he might want of Humphreys' account could be obtained there.

By Mr. Lister :

1443. This man was working in Mr. Henry's room, and the work was given by Mr. Henry?—He is in charge of more than one room.

1444. But the work was given by Mr. Henry?—So it appears.

1445. Well, was not Mr. Henry the proper person to certify to that account?—Certainly; there is no doubt about that.

By Mr. Somerville :

1446. In the course of evidence here Mr. Pereira said he had accounts made out in the names of Ellen Berry and Lizzie Evans, and he kept the proceeds. You don't know anything about that?—No; I only know now for the first time, although I had heard since these things have come to be talked about it has been stated to me, but not as a matter of personal knowledge.

1447. When were you appointed Deputy Minister?—In 1884.

1448. And you were not aware Mr. Pereira was drawing money in the name of Miss Lizzie Evans and Mrs. Ellen Berry all these years?—It was paid in 1885, I think

By the Chairman :

1449. It was stated by Mr. Pereira that you were aware of that fact, that the late Hon. Thomas White had authorised \$400 worth of work to be done by his wife. Were you aware of that?—I have served under six Ministers, Mr. Chairman, three of them living and three of them dead, but I do not feel at liberty to indicate what any of them may have said to me in the course of confidential communications.

By Mr. Somerville :

1450. It was stated, Mr. Burgess, you received permission from the Minister?—Certainly, that is quite correct, I have myself said to Mr. White, when I heard sup-

plementary payments were to be made to the Private Secretaries in the Militia Department, that Mr. Pereira had worked for Sir David Macpherson night and day, and I thought that during the period preceding and succeeding the Rebellion he had probably not more than two hours sleep at night, as nearly as I could judge. Since the others were being dealt with in that way, I thought he should be dealt with in a similar fashion. Mr. White then made confidential communications to me of the reasons why he would not recommend a grant to Mr. Pereira. They were not personal to Mr. Pereira in any way, but he suggested to me, instead, that I might find means of giving him something. He said his wife was a clever woman, to his knowledge, and could write a clever hand. There was no reason she should not get some of the very large amount of extra work in the Department. I might say, until I looked at the letter which Mr. Pereira referred to the other day, if I had been asked what my recollection was of the amount I would have said \$600. On referring to my note to Mr. Richard White I find the amount stated at \$400.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant):

1451. How many officials of the Department of the Interior are authorised to certify to accounts?—There would be the Surveyor General, or the officer acting for him, the Secretary, the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Henry; or if Mr. Henry were absent then the officer acting for him, would be entitled to certify in the same way with Mr. Pereira.

1452. That would be all?—That would not be all.

By Mr. Lister:

1453. Mr. Nelson?—Yes; Mr. Nelson.

1454. I suppose every permanent clerk who has any one extra working with him?—No one certainly, below an ordinary second-class clerk.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant):

1455. Does he certify to it, and does it pass supervision in that way?—No, it comes to me for approval.

1456. I don't see how you account for it?—Well, I do manage to keep track of it.

The Committee then adjourned.

COMMITTEE ROOM,
THURSDAY, 23rd July, 1891.

Committee met.—Mr. SPROULE in the Chair.

Mr. BURGESS recalled and further examined :—

By Mr. Somerville :

1457. I would like to ask a few questions with regard to the payment of money by Mr. Pereira to Mr. Richard White, of Montreal, to be taken out of extra work which was to be furnished by you under an understanding with the late Minister. You have in your possession a letter instructing Mr. Richard White that the payment should be made?—Informing him, yes.

1458. Well, I would like to have that letter?—I have not got a copy of the original letter.

1459. If you have a copy of the letter I think we ought to have it, because it is important for us to know that an arrangement of that kind was made?—I tell you an arrangement of that kind was made.

1460. Mr. Pereira got \$400 worth of extra work, and the amount he received for the work was to repay a loan by Mr. Richard White?—That is not the way.

1461. That shows the necessity of having that letter; we want the facts of the case?—I can tell you the facts of the case.

1462. Well, then, you say this arrangement was made with the then Minister of the Interior, that Mr. Pereira was to get this extra work?—That Mr. Pereira was to get this extra work.

1463. For what?—In consideration of the fact that the Minister had not found it possible to obtain the same consideration for Mr. Pereira that was given to the private secretaries in the Militia Department for the same class of service.

1464. How did it come that Mr. Richard White's name was mixed up with the transaction?—Mr. Pereira would be better able to explain that than I; but my recollection is this, that Mr. Pereira, these arrangements having been made, wrote to Mr. Richard White, who was an old friend of his, asking him to advance him some money on the faith of this arrangement, and Mr. Richard White expressed his readiness to do so, providing I would write him a letter telling him the arrangement, and undertaking to see that the money was sent to him from time to time as it was earned.

By Mr. Adams :

1465. He was to get extra work?—Mrs. Pereira was to get the extra work.

By Mr. Somerville :

1466. You became responsible to Mr. Richard White for the payment of this money, out of the earnings of Mrs. Pereira?—Yes.

1467. Was that all there was in this letter?—That was all there was in the letter as far as I recollect.

1468. Did the Minister know anything about this arrangement?—Which arrangement do you mean?

1469. That Mr. Richard White was to be paid this money?—I could not say that.

1470. Had you any conversation with him about it?—No, I had not. That took place subsequent to the conversation I had with the Minister about Mr. Pereira and the extra work.

1471. Well, you said, in the course of your examination at one of the previous meetings, that the payments that were made to Mr. Turner were commenced after Mr. White was appointed Minister of the Interior?—That was my recollection.

1472. It was for special work?—Yes, that was my recollection, and is my recollection still.

1473. Are you not aware that the practice was in vogue before that time, and that Mr. Turner was drawing money in the name of Joseph Wright, and in the name of his wife before that?—No.

1474. You were not aware of that?—No.

1475. You were not aware of it at the time?—I have no recollection of it.

1476. Could he draw that money in that way without your knowledge?—I think very likely he could. As I explained before, a great many extra clerks were employed, whose names I did not know, and whose personality I was not acquainted with.

1477. Then you are positive you have no knowledge of this money being paid in that way, before the arrangement was made with Mr. White?—I am as positive as I can be about a thing that took place so long ago; I have no recollection of it.

1478. You went out to the North-West some time ago and got sick. What date was that?—I have been taken sick twice in the North-West.

1479. Well, about 1888 you were away for about six months?—More than six months.

1480. Do you remember the dates?—I could not say the date of my leaving here exactly; it was some time either in the latter part of June or the early part of July.

1481. In 1888?—Yes.

1482. And when did you get back?—I got back to my office on 1st January, 1889.

1483. Indexing the Dominion Lands Act would be special work entrusted to the regular officers of the Department, would it not?—It would greatly depend on the condition of the work in the Department at the time.

1484. It is not work likely to be entrusted to outsiders?—It might be.

1485. Is it possible that you would give it to men not working in the building at all?—It might be.

By Mr. Bowell:

1486. It is just the kind of work to be given to an outsider?—I have no particular recollection of the indexing of the Act, but I should think that work might be done outside.

H. KINLOCH called, sworn and examined:—

By Mr. Somerville:

1487. What position do you hold in the Interior Department?—First-class clerk.

1488. How long have you been in that position?—As first-class clerk, six or seven years. I have been in the Service about 15 years.

1489. What is your salary now?—\$1650, I think.

1490. Are you aware of any irregular payments having been made to permanent clerks in the Interior Department contrary to the provisions of the Civil Service Act?—No, sir.

1491. You are not aware of any irregularities of that character?—No, sir.

1492. You are not aware that work was given to extra clerks, and after the work had been certified to and payments ordered that the money was afterwards divided with permanent clerks?—I know more about that since I have heard of this investigation than I did before. I did not know it.

1493. You were not aware of that?—No, sir.

1494. Did you never share any of that money yourself?—No, sir.
1495. You are positive as to that?—Yes, sir.
1496. Do you know a man named William McMahon?—Yes.
1497. Where is he engaged just now?—Just now he is assistant superintendent of the Printing Bureau.
1498. Are you aware that Mr. McMahon has done some work for the Department of the Interior?—No.
1499. You are not aware of it?—No.
1500. Here is an account, "Department of the Interior to William McMahon Dr.; to copying 152 folios, \$15.20?—Yes.
1501. You see who witnessed the payment of that?—Yes.
1502. Is not that your name attached?—Yes.
1503. Does not that account bring it to your recollection?—To the best of my recollection that work was done by a lady who did not wish her name to appear. The account was made out in Mr. McMahon's name and he signed the receipt. Mr. McMahon got not one cent of that, neither did I.
1504. Who got it?—A lady.
1505. Who was the lady?—Miss Armstrong.
1506. Miss E. M. Armstrong?—No.
1507. What is her name?—I am not sure of the initials. I know the first one is "C," but I do not know the second one.
1508. How did it come that the work was done in that roundabout way?—It was a time when we were very much pressed in the Department. We were sending a great deal of copying out of the Department, in fact we were pushed for copyists. That lady was a friend of mine who was glad to receive copying and I had this done for her as she did not wish her name to appear. Mr. McMahon was a friend of mine and he allowed the use of his name as far as signing the receipt and endorsing the cheque, but as far as receiving any part of the money he had no more to do with than I had.
1509. You swear you did not get anything of the proceeds of the work?—Not one nickel.
1510. Here is another account from Mr. McMahon?—The same thing.
(Exhibits Nos. 5, 6, 7 and 8 filed).
1511. You see that account (Exhibit No. 8) is for work in indexing Dominion Lands Act?—Yes, sir.
1512. Work of that character is done in the Department is it not?—Work of that character very seldom turned up.
1513. How is that?—Well, indexing of that Act needed somebody specially qualified from his intimacy with the Act and with a legal knowledge to do it properly, that could not have been done by an outsider as well as it could have been done by those familiar with the Act.
1514. You say that this required special knowledge, the preparing of this index?—I do not mean to say that exactly. What I mean to say is, it would be very much better done by somebody who is familiar with the Act, and having some legal knowledge.
1515. According to that statement, it would not be likely that that work would be given to a lady?—Certainly not.
1516. Was this work given to this same lady?—No.
1517. Who was it given to?—It was given to Mr. Rothwell and myself.
1518. You did this work?—We did it together.
1519. And you got Mr. McMahon to allow you to use his name?—Yes.
1520. Why did you do that?—Because it could not be given to permanent clerks. We did this work night after night, Sunday after Sunday. It was worth \$100 if it was worth a cent.
1521. When you did this work you knew you were contravening the Civil Service Act and the oath you took when you entered the service?—I knew I had done the work for this.

1522. Read over that oath.—(Reads the oath previously given in the proceedings.)

1523. You were aware this could not be allowed to you by law?—No; it could be allowed by law.

1524. If voted by Parliament, but in no other way.—The oath reads: "In the discharge of the duties of my office"?—That was not a matter that came within the duties of my office.

1525. If it is a straightforward transaction, why did you need to get the use of Mr. McMahon's name?—That is a matter for the interior economy of the Department.

1526. When you did this were you aware that it was being practised by other permanent clerks of the Department, and that this system was in operation there?—I was not aware of anything at all there, except that I was told to do this work in my extra hours, and I did it with the assistance of Mr. Rothwell. I worked for more than twice that amount.

1527. You do not mean to say that you invented this system of getting money?—Oh, no.

1528. You knew it had been invented before?—I did not know; I know I earned the money and got it.

1529. There is a memorandum put on this amount: "Who is he?" Who put that there?—I do not know.

1530. You have no idea who put that there?—No.

The AUDITOR GENERAL.—It is written by a clerk in the Audit Office.

1531. Here is another amount, \$13.20 (Exhibit No. 9), in the name of Mr. William McMahon for copying in 1884. Who did this work?—The same lady I mentioned before.

1532. Whose writing is that in the account?—Mine.

1533. "Copying a portion of Moose Jaw squatters file, 132 folios." Who has charge of this?—The Registrar of the Department.

1534. Who is the Registrar?—Mr. Henry was, but he is suspended at present.

1535. Here is another account of Mr. McMahon's. What is that? Is that your writing: "For copying M. A. files 1693" (Exhibit No. 10)? What does that refer to?—The Manitoba Act files.

1536. Who did this work?—The same lady.

1537. When these cheques were drawn in favour of W. McMahon, who were they sent to?—To him for endorsement.

1538. Is it not necessary that all receipts shall be witnessed?—It is customary.

1539. You see that receipt?—Yes.

1540. Mr. McMahon's name is there, and there is no witness to it?—That is for the Auditor General and the Finance Department to deal with.

1541. Who approved of that account?—Mr. Douglas.

1542. How did you come to think of getting Mr. McMahon to let you use his name for this purpose?—He is a very intimate friend of mine, and it was as I told you before. The lady did not wish to have her name mentioned, and it answered all practical and honest purposes that somebody else should have got it. There was no concealment in the matter.

1543. That will do, as far as the lady is concerned, but in the other case where you did the work, why did you then get Mr. McMahon to allow you the use of his name?—For the same reason as Mr. Pereira says, that permanent clerks are not given that sort of work when others are anxious to get it.

1544. You swear positively, Mr. Kinloch, you did not receive a portion of this money yourself. I may as well tell you that I have information which is to the effect that you received the whole of it?—Your information is absolutely incorrect. I deny that most flatly.

1545. You got the portion that was for indexing the Dominion Lands Act?—I got half.

1546. Who got the other half?—Mr. Rothwell.

1547. Was any other officer of the Department aware that this—I might call it crooked transaction—was being done?—I cannot answer a question that you infer. Why don't you say it was a crooked transaction? I don't think it was.

Mr. T. G. ROTHWELL recalled, and further examined:—

By Mr. Somerville:

1548. You wish to make a statement?—The payment that was stated to have been made to me—I don't know what the amount is, for I have never seen the cheque—was for work done by myself and Mr. Kinloch, when I was an extra clerk in the Department. My appointment as a permanent clerk took place almost two or three days after the work was completed, and I remember thinking that the money would be lost, and mentioning it to Mr. Kinloch, who said it would be all right. Afterwards, I think, he gave me \$30. What I said here the other day was that I had not been paid one cent for any extra clerk's work I had done as a permanent clerk in the Department. I was considerably excited over it.

1549. You got \$30?—\$30 from Mr. Kinloch. I think that is the amount; I don't remember whether it was \$25 or \$30.

By Mr. Foster:

1550. For work done when you were an extra clerk?—When I was an extra clerk. It was a few days before I was permanently appointed. I had helped Mr. Kinloch at his own house to do the work; after I left here the other day I thought of the matter.

By Mr. Barron:

1551. Was Mr. Kinloch a permanent clerk?—Yes; at that time. I asked Mr. Beddoe, Assistant Accountant, to find out, if he could, what was paid. He described the cheque to me particularly, and told me that on it was marked in my own handwriting "Received."

1552. You got \$30 of this amount?—\$25 or \$30. I don't remember if Mr. Burgess paid me when I was an extra clerk. Since I have been a permanent clerk of the Department I never received one six-pence, and the newspaper accounts of the evidence given here are not very correct. I have seen it stated that the \$100 worth of work given to Mrs. Rothwell to do—of which she only did a portion, and the balance was never done—is credited with having been given by the Minister. If I said that, it was not correct; it was Mr. Burgess.

Mr. J. R. HALL called, sworn and examined:—

By Mr. Somerville:

1553. What office do you hold in the Interior Department?—Secretary.

1554. What is your salary?—\$2,800.

1555. You sometimes certify to cheques, do you not?—Yes; if I know that the work is done, but it is not my practice to certify. I require some permanent officer to certify. I approve and pass the account for payment. I don't certify unless I know, to my own knowledge, that the work has been done.

1556. When "Approved" is written on an account what does it signify?—It is an authority to the Accountant to pay the amount. The Accountant won't pay unless the Deputy or myself authorizes him to pay. The approval is the authority for the Accountant to pay that account.

1557. And in order that you may approve of an account, the account must be certified to by some competent authority in the Department as being correct?—Yes, by a permanent officer always—the head of the room in which the work is done.

1558.—Is it not a fact, that at times the accounts are certified to by not only first but by second and third class clerks?—Yes.

1559. Is there any rule as to who should certify to accounts?—The rule is, that the man in charge of the work should certify. There might be a third-class clerk, who would have work given out to several of these ladies outside to copy, and he would have to count it when it came in. In that case I would take a certificate.

1560. Have you no written or printed instructions from the Finance Department, regulating the payment of money in your Department?—Not that I know of, except the Civil Service Act.

1561. Have you no general rules for your guidance?—Only the Civil Service Act.

1562. I was given to understand there were some printed instructions issued by the Finance Department, or the Treasury Board?—There was a Treasury Board minute, I think, somewhere about July, 1882, after the Act of 1882 went into force, laying down regulations, but that was about the attendance book, and about going out to lunch, and I think also there was a paragraph in that about the payment of extra clerks, but I cannot remember.

1563. Is that still in force, then?—That is still in force.

1564. Have you a copy of it in the Department?—Yes.

1565. I would like you to send me one over. You heard the evidence given with regard to those McMahon accounts and cheques?—Yes.

1566. I see you approved of some of those accounts. I think that is your signature on Exhibit 8?—Yes; that is my signature; that is for indexing the Dominion Lands Act.

1567. You approved of that?—I authorized the work, and I approved the account.

1568. You authorized the work?—Yes; I told Rothwell and Kinloch to do that indexing.

1569. You knew that Kinloch was not entitled to do that work, yet you allowed him to do it?—Yes; but Rothwell was an extra clerk at the time. He was entitled to do it.

1570. Why did you tell Kinloch?—He got Kinloch to help him.

1571. Why did you tell Kinloch?—It was to help Kinloch.

1572. In what way?—Financially, unquestionably.

1573. You are aware this system has been carried on in your Department for some years, of giving extra work or extra clerks work, with the understanding that they were to share the proceeds with permanent clerks?—Yes.

1574. You know that has been done?—Yes.

1575. It has been the practice?—Yes.

1576. Since when?—I could not tell when it began. I came into the Department in 1883. It may have been done before my time.

1577. But has it been done continuously since your time?—I think so.

1578. You think it has?—On special occasions—that is, special work; but it is not an everyday occurrence.

1579. It was usual, when an officer of the Department became “hard up,” or got into financial difficulties, that you would throw a little of this extra work in his way, would you not?—If I could.

1580. That was the practice?—Yes; I have had to go down to the court house to take a man “out of bond,” because I wanted him to come to work for me. I cannot do that out of my own pocket.

By Mr. Barron :

1581. You were anxious to have the work done?—Yes.

By Mr. Somerville:

1582. Did you ever have any conversation with an extra clerk named McCabe about dividing the proceeds that he used to get for some work that he did?—No; never. I never told extra clerks to divide up with permanent clerks; that was an arrangement entirely between themselves. It was a matter of honour. If an extra clerk got a permanent clerk to help him, and divided up, it was a matter of honour. I never got any extra clerk to share up with a permanent clerk.

1583. Do you remember having a conversation with a permanent clerk named Brough?—I have had a great many conversations with Brough. He was in the Department before I entered the Interior Department.

1584. He is a favourite of yours, is he not?—Not particularly.

1585. Do you remember the time Mr. Brough was about to be married?—Yes.

1586. Did not you ask an extra clerk in the Department to whom extra work was given to divide up with Mr. Brough, because you wanted to assist him a little now that he was going to be married?—I do not recollect it. Who was the extra clerk?

1587. McCabe?—I never asked McCabe to share with Brough. I once allowed Brough to do a little extra work after his marriage. It amounted to \$12. He got it in his wife's name. You will see it in the Auditor General's Report, "Mary Brough." It is the only account of the kind that I remember.

1588. You will understand that I am working somewhat in the dark; sometimes I may not be on the right track?—I will give you all the information in my power.

1589. You remember the case of Joseph Wright. You have seen that reported?—Yes; that is Turner's case.

1590. You know there was no such man as Joseph Wright ever employed about the Department?—Yes.

1591. Do you know that Mr. Turner drew the money?—Yes; and did the work.

1592. I see that your name is attached to this account in Joseph Wright's name?—Yes, "Certified correct, P. B. Douglas." "Approved" by me July 1887. I was probably Acting Deputy at the time. Generally the Deputy would go to the North-West in summer time.

1593. You were acting Deputy then?—Yes; I signed the cheque as acting Deputy.

1594. Here is your signature again—July, 1887?—Yes.

1595. Here is another signature of yours—August, 1887?—Yes.

1596. You were aware at the time you signed these cheques and approved the accounts that no such man as Joseph Wright existed?—Not that there was no such man as Joseph Wright, but that Turner was doing the work and getting the money. Turner says there is such a man—a friend of his.

1597. You are aware that this system is being carried on in the Department from the time you entered the service of the Government?—Of the Interior Department. I have been 23 years in the service of the Government.

1598. This practice was contrary to law?—Certainly. The Civil Service Act was being broken.

By Mr. Taylor:

1599. In all these payments that have been made to your knowledge, has the work been done in every case and a saving to the Government been effected, rather than by giving it to outsiders?—Unquestionably.

1600. In every case?—Yes.

1601. In any case has a payment been made unless the work has been actually performed and the money earned?—The work was always done, and well done, by the permanent men. Wherever a permanent man got money beyond his salary, he rendered full value for it.

1602. Is it not a fact that you, Mr. Kinloch and Mr. McMahan are very great friends?—That is putting it too strong. I have a great many friends.

1632. He got an Irish hoist out of the Department?—We could not keep him here, and we did not want to turn him off. We sent him up to Winnipeg, where there happened to be a vacancy, and put him in the Commissioner's office.

1633. Are you aware that Mr. Humphreys divided these moneys he earned with some permanent clerks?—I do not think he did. I think he got it all himself. I cannot say positively, but from what I know of Humphreys I think he knew he was entitled to it and kept it himself. He did the work.

1634. He must have been an exception to the general rule?—We have got good and bad there.

1635. I mean to the general rule of dividing up. He must have been a favourite in not being asked to divide up with the permanent men?—As I said before, I never asked an extra clerk to divide up with permanent men.

1636. You must admit that this man must have been a favourite when he was allowed to keep it himself?—He was a good clerk, and all good clerks are favourites.

1637. Do you know Miss H. M. Mosden?—No.

1638. Do you know whether she ever did work for the Department?—I do not recollect her at all.

1639. Do you know Miss E. M. McRae?—No.

1640. Never heard of her?—I may have seen the account, but never saw her in flesh—so to speak.

1641. Do you know A. Dubuque?—No; his name is not familiar in connection with any extra work in the Department.

1642. Do you know N. S. Dubuque?—No.

1643. Do you know Miss E. N. Charbonneau?—Yes; she represents Mr. Loyer, of the Crown Timber Office. He got about \$15 per month in her name.

1644. What is his first name?—François.

1645. He draws in the name of Miss Charbonneau?—In the name of Miss Charbonneau.

1646. This Miss Charbonneau is a fictitious person?—No; she is some relation of Loyer's.

1647. Does she live in the city?—I think so.

By Mr. Bowell :

1648. Is Loyer a permanent clerk?—Yes.

By Mr. Somerville :

1649. How long has Loyer been getting this money?—Since 1887. There was an old man named Gormully, who came from Cobourg, who was employed at \$45 a month to assist Loyer. Loyer is a very excellent clerk and has a lot of work to do. Gormully died about 1887, and Mr. Ryley, who is in charge of the Timber and Mines Branch, consulted with Mr. Burgess and myself as to who should take Gormully's place. Our policy was not to increase the staff, and the suggestion was made by Mr. Ryley that Loyer should come back and work at night. He was a married man, and a very hard worker, and was getting a salary of \$600 or \$700 a year. He was asked to come back to do the work at \$15 a month for which Gormully had got \$45. Neither Burgess nor I saw there was any harm in this, and we allowed it to be done. It was an infraction of the Civil Service Act, but we were saving \$30 per month. Mr. Loyer, being a permanent clerk, could not draw this money in his own name, and, therefore, drew it in the name of a female relative—Miss Charbonneau.

1650. You see this letter on page D-157 of the Auditor General's Report for 1890 (letter filed as Exhibit No. 11 and read):—

“AUDIT OFFICE, OTTAWA, March 14, 1890.

“SIR,—During the fiscal year 1888-89, and also during the first six months of the current fiscal year, Miss E. Charbonneau has been paid out of the vote for Dominion Lands \$15 a month for copying 300 folios each month, 5 cents a folio. The small

chances of a round sum for one month, and of an equality of work for two months, both become impossibilities when the time extends over eighteen months. Please have the vouchers amended if the arrangement is for \$15 a month.

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

"J. L. McDOUGALL, A.G.

"The Dy. Minister of Interior."

Yes; the Auditor General thought there was something irregular.

1651. You did not reply until 20th May, when the Assistant Secretary replied as follows:—

"DEPT. OF INTERIOR, OTTAWA, May 20, 1890.

"SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 14th March last, in relation to the payments made to Miss E. Charbonneau for copying, I am directed to explain to you that the account is made out for 300 folios each month, as that is the outside limit that this Department will pay in one month, in this case, for copying. The Deputy Minister, it may be added, takes care to assure himself each time that the work done is not less than that limit.

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

"LYNDWODE PEREIRA,

"Asst. Secy."

"The Auditor General."

1652. Do you know Miss Florence K. Campbell?—No; the name is strange to me in the Interior.

1653. Do you know any other mysterious strangers whose names appear in the Auditor General's Report and whose names are used by permanent clerks in the Department. Tell me all you know?—There are the three regular ones: Joseph Wright for Turner, Jane Hay for Rowatt and Miss Charbonneau for Loyer. These were three good men, working hard, and got this extra remuneration in this round-about and irregular way.

1654. Do you know a man named C. Gordon?—No; there is a McDonald Gordon, who is our Inspector of Agencies; but I do not know C. Gordon.

1655. You do not know him at all?—No.

1656. Do you know a man named C. C. Rogers?—Yes; he is a second-class clerk.

1657. In the Department?—Yes. His principal duty is looking after Orders in Council. We print a whole volume of them every year affecting the Department.

By Mr. Cameron (Inverness):

1658. Did Mr. Brough ever get money under another name?—Not that I know.

1659. Do you know that F. McCabe got money and shared with Brough?—If McCabe shared up with Brough I could not possibly know, but I say distinctly I never told McCabe to share with Brough or with anybody. I never told any extra clerk he must share with a permanent clerk.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant):

1660. With reference to the matter Sir Richard Cartwright was speaking of, I would like to find out the rules of the Department. I understand the rules of the Department are that whoever gives out work is authorized so to do, and is the one who has to certify to the account?—Not only does he give it out, but he sees it when it comes back and counts it before he certifies. The work that is given out is paid for at so much a folio, at 5 cents a hundred words. Some permanent clerk must actually count that work, and certify that the account is a correct one.

1661. That is where I am a little confused. You say some permanent clerk does that. Can any permanent clerk certify?—No; it must be the permanent clerk who has charge, but we prefer the head of the room. If three or four men are working in a room the senior clerk should certify.

1662. But if he did not, do I understand you to say that any permanent clerk can?—Yes. The head of the room may be absent on leave or ill, and a permanent clerk, but no extra clerk, can certify to an account. There is some rule, I think. The Auditor General knows the rule, and the Audit Office would not take a certificate unless it was from a proper person.

1663. In the case of a person doing this extra work, could any of the permanent clerks certify to that without first speaking to the head of the Department, so to speak?—Yes.

1664. Well, then, really, the certificate of any permanent clerk is accepted, and the account passed on it. Is that the rule of the Department?—Yes; that is the rule. We assume that all the permanent clerks are reliable and honourable men, who would not certify to anything that is not true.

1665. How many permanent clerks would there be in the Department?—I guess some 50 or 60 permanent clerks.

1666. Would you consider it a regular transaction—that of Mr. Pereira, referred to by Sir Richard Cartwright—when the immediate officer over Mr. Humphreys gave him the work, and having been asked to certify to the account declined to do so—that it was proper for him then to go to Mr. Pereira, and Mr. Pereira to certify to it, without consulting the person who had given out the work? Is that quite proper?—That was irregular, but I would point out Mr. Pereira occupied a little different position, as Assistant Secretary, to the ordinary run of permanent clerks. He might assume a little more executive authority than the ordinary second or third-class clerks.

1667. But if any permanent clerk certifies to an account you don't go beyond that?—Not unless I suspect there is something wrong.

By Mr. Foster :

1668. Suppose A and B are permanent clerks, and that A gives out a lot of work to some person, can the person who does the work take that to B, who did not give it out, and did not know of its being given out, and get it certified and passed?—No; I would never take a certificate from a man who did not know positively that the work had been done.

1669. What I want to get at is this : Must it be the person who gives out the work, or with his supervision? I can quite see how any person can count the work and judge that the work tallied with that given out, but should he not then go to the person who gave out the work in order to get it certified?—No; because I might myself, as Secretary, give out a whole bundle of papers to somebody to copy. Well, I cannot count that when it comes in; somebody else will count it.

1670. But you would certify to it?—I would approve it for payment on the certificate of the person who had counted it.

1671. That would be something you yourself knew about?—I would know that it had been given out, but not that it had been properly counted. I would take the certificate of the officer counting it that it had been properly counted.

1672. But suppose some other officer, who knew nothing about the transaction, did what you suggest?—I don't quite catch the question.

1673. Supposing Mr. Henry gave it out?—He never gave out any work. Mr. Henry's work is registration work.

By Mr. Taylor :

1674. As I understand it, the permanent clerk certifies to the work being done. Then a clerk goes to either you or Mr. Burgess to approve the account, and then you or Mr. Burgess will not approve of it until you question the certifying clerk, and are satisfied that the work has been performed?—Yes; excepting that it is not necessary the certifying clerk should bring the account to me. The person in whose favour the account is made might bring it to me and ask me to pass it, or bring it to the accountant, and the Accountant might collect those accounts and bring them in a batch to me.

1675. And you do not pass them until you make enquiries that everything has been done, and you are satisfied by the certifying clerks that the work has been done, before you approve?—Certainly; I never passed any bogus account. I satisfied myself always the value was received for the money to be paid.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant):

1676. You mean by that you are satisfied it is not bogus, because the name of the person authorised to sign is attached to it, and that makes it genuine?—Well, a fictitious name might be attached, but I mean I would be satisfied that the work was done.

1677. That was an irregular thing that Mr. Pereira did?—Yes.

1678. Well, was there any means by which you might be able to detect that irregularity?—I had to accept a certificate from the Assistant Secretary, a man holding a position next to myself in the Department, without any question.

1679. And he could have done it many times, if he had chosen to do so, and there would be no way of checking the irregularity?—I would not question a certificate.

1680. If it was some one lower than Mr. Pereira in position—would you question it in the case of the certificate of any permanent clerk?—If I did not know what it was for I would question it. I would send for the parties and ask: "What was this work; what did you do; where did you do it," and find out all about it.

1681. But as a matter of fact, it is largely, if not wholly, a matter of honour for these permanent clerks. You have to trust almost entirely to their honour?—I must do so with a large staff like that.

By Mr. Denison:

1682. How long have you been in the service?—I was in the Finance Department from 1867 to 1871; then I resigned and went into the Department of Justice, where I remained from 1873 to 1882, when I entered the Interior Department.

1683. Were payments ever made, before the Civil Service Act was passed, to permanent clerks?—In the Department of Justice?

1684. Anywhere?—No. I was nine years in the Department of Justice, working nights and Sundays, and never got a cent of extra pay.

1685. In any case, do you know if it was ever done?—I don't know. I worked in the Finance Department and the Department of Justice, and I only got about \$20 extra work in the six years I was in the former Department. That is the only extra work I have had since I entered the service.

1686. I want to get at whether it was done at all?—I don't know; I cannot speak of other Departments.

By Sir Richard Cartwright:

1687. Not to your knowledge?—No.

By the Chairman:

1688. You would accept Mr. Pereira's certificate that the work was performed unhesitatingly?—Most unquestionably.

1689. Was Mr. Pereira, in certifying to work, not aware he was acting in an irregular matter?—I cannot assume that Mr. Pereira did not know it.

By Mr. Taylor:

1690. I would ask the witness if this work that was given to Mr. Turner and the other permanent clerks was absolutely in the interests of the Department?—Certainly.

1691. If it had not been performed by these clerks you would have had to call in other experts or else outside assistance?—Yes; we would have had to get a good man to do Mr. Turner's work. He is an excellent clerk.

1692. And the other permanent clerks referred to as doing extra work?—Yes.

1693. Had you not given it to permanent clerks it would have cost more money and would not have been as well done?—Yes; we could not have got a man for it; we could not get a man, without much difficulty, to do the work Loyer was doing on these works. I might remark here that all this extra work has been stopped, and will never be resumed again in the Department.

By Mr. Somerville:

1694. Since when?—Since last June. It occurred in this way: There was a minute of the Treasury Board over-ruling a decision of the Auditor General. The Auditor General had always taken the ground that the Dominion Lands Income vote, out of which the extra clerks were paid, was not subject to the provisions of the Civil Service Act. The Auditor General had always held that view, and the Department was justified, therefore, in paying extra clerks more than if they had been paid out of Civil Government Contingencies, which, under the Civil Service Act, would only be the minimum of the salary of a third-class clerk, \$400. The Department did not pay them out of Civil Government contingencies, but out of the Dominion Lands Income vote at the head office at Ottawa, and the Department always felt we could do pretty much as we pleased, and pay for the extra work out of that vote. The Minister of Justice, however, decided otherwise. Mr. McDougall said he was very glad to be over-ruled; he still held to his opinion, but in the interest of the Civil Service he was glad to have his objection over-ruled; and accordingly, in the case of a clerk named Philip Low, there was a minute of the Treasury Board over-ruling Low and placing him on the permanent list. In future anything paid in the Department must be in accordance with the Civil Service Act.

Mr. BOWELL.—Or by vote of Parliament.

By Mr. Bowell:

1695. Or special vote of Parliament?—Yes; as in the case of Mr. Rowatt.

By Mr. Chrysler:

1696. Will you say whether, in your view of the Civil Service Act, you thought that these payments were outside of that Act?—I always thought so.

1697. And that was the view entertained by the Auditor General as well as by yourself?—Yes.

1698. Until the decision you speak of?—Yes.

1699. That decision was given—when?—In June last. It was given verbally some time ago by Sir John Thompson. He had told us nearly 18 months ago that this Dominion Lands income money should be subject to the provisions of the Civil Service Act. He had not done that officially, but at that time Mr. Burgess warned all these temporary clerks that they would have to pass the Civil Service Act and come down from \$500 a year to \$400, and that if they did not pass the examinations they would have to get out. It was not until the Treasury Board passed the minute that decisive action was taken.

1700. That was the view entertained up to that time?—Yes.

By Mr. McGregor:

1701. Do you know of any case, outside of that of Pereira's, where a man gives out the work to himself and certified to his own account?—No.

By Mr. Chapleau:

1702. Are you aware that that work given by Pereira to be done by his wife, was with the consent of the authorities of his Department?—I take it that he had the authority of the Deputy Minister.

1703. You did not know it yourself?—No.

1704. You did not know that it was a kind of compensation to him for extra work done during the time of North-West insurrection, and which was to be paid by some extra work done by his wife?—I know that now.

WILLIAM McMAHON called, 'sworn and examined:—

By Mr. Somerville:

1705. What position do you occupy in the service of the Government?—At present I am the Assistant Superintendent of Printing.

1706. How long have you occupied that position?—About two years. I was appointed to the Civil Service about July, 1890.

1707. Previous to that, what was your engagement?—I was employed with the Government contractors for printing.

1708. McLean, Roger & Co. ?—Yes.

1709. Had you ever been in the Civil Service previous to the appointment you now hold?—Never.

1710. You were not in the Civil Service in 1884?—Never previous to the date I have just now given.

1711. You are aware that a number of accounts were passed through the Interior Department for payment for work said to have been done by you. Here is one of them (referring to Exhibit No. 10)?—That is a cheque made payable to me.

1712. Is that your signature?—That is my signature on the back.

1713. Did you ever do any of the work in the Department?—Never.

1714. Not for the Department at all?—Never.

1715. You never performed any services for these sums at all?—Never; nor ever received any money.

1716. How did you come to lend your name to the officers of the Department?—It was asked for as an accommodation. Seeing that the cheque was an official one, that it was countenanced by the Department, I did not think it anything out of the way to endorse the cheque. The cheque was made out in my name; I saw it was an official one. The work was supposed to be done, or was done, and consequently as it was an accommodation I signed the cheque.

1717. You say you did not do any work?—Yes.

1718. Did you make the accounts yourself?—I did not.

1719. Who brought the account to you?—Mr. Kinloch brought the cheque to me.

1720. You did not know anything about the account?—No; the cheque was brought to me.

1721. You never saw anything but the cheque?—I never saw anything but the cheque; I never saw the money.

1722. You did not know what was in the account?—The cheque was presented to me; I endorsed the cheque and handed it back.

1723. Did you know what the cheque was for?—I supposed it was for extra work, but I did not know.

1724. You did not do any extra work?—No; but as the gentleman who presented it to me must have done the extra work, I took it for granted it was so when he received the cheque from the officers of the Department.

1725. Did you ask any explanation why the cheques were submitted to you?—I asked what they were for, and he said extra work.

1726. And you allowed your name to be used?—That is all; as an accommodation. If the officers of the Department permitted him to do extra work it was all right. I knew him to be able to do it quicker than the ordinary extra clerk could do it.

1727. You did not think it was any of your business to inquire anything about it?—So long as the cheque was made out by the officers of the Department in which that gentleman was employed I saw no reason for inquiring.

C. C. ROGERS called, sworn and examined:—

By Mr. Somerville:

1728. What position do you hold in the Interior Department?—The position of a second-class clerk.

1729. What is your salary?—\$1,400 a year, the same as it has been for seven years.

1730. They have not been using you right?—I have been in the same position for seven years.

1731. You ought to have been advanced?—I have not said so.

By Mr. Bowell:

1732. You have been a second-class clerk for seven years?—I have been receiving the salary of a senior second-class clerk for seven years.

By Mr. Somerville:

1733. Did you ever get any money for extra work performed?—Where? I received extra money in the Department during twenty-one years.

1734. There is an account here in the name of C. Gordon. (Exhibit No. 12.)—That was not received by me.

1735. Do you know Gordon?—Yes.

1736. Who is he?—It isn't a he at all; it is a she.

1737. Who is she?—I suppose you all know that my brother was shot in the North-West Territories in 1885, and he has never received anything—or, rather, his people—from the Government. I have been at several times straitened in circumstances, and that lady is my sister-in-law, whom I have kept for twenty years, and she has helped me on a great many occasions when I have taken work home; and I have asked Mr. Burgess to give her some small assistance in the way of giving us some extra work. That work has been done faithfully and thoroughly. I have seen to it myself. I have been doing night work for the Government all my life.

1738. Your sister-in-law did this work?—Yes. She has not been employed by anybody. I have had to keep her.

1739. She is not your brother's wife?—No; he was single. To show you how I was straitened, you see here (showing some letters) that Sir David Macpherson recommended me for promotion and a bonus of \$100 for long and hard work; but I never got it. You will also see Mr. Lindsay Russell's testimonial.

1740. Here is an account, certified to by whom?—Mr. Côté. It was work done for his branch. It was copying files with regard to the Half-breeds. There was a great deal of work of that kind in 1886.

1741. Did Mr. Côté know about this?—Yes; he knew it was a lady. I did not tell him who it was. I told him it was done by a lady, because I had had to certify to the account before.

1742. Did this lady do the work, or you?—She did it, but I helped her a good deal. Some of it had to be compared, and I had to show her how to do it. She is a lady who is capable of doing work.

1743. You did some of it?—I have no doubt I did a great deal of it. I have had to read all those things.

1744. Here is another account in the name of C. Gordon (Exhibit No. 13)?—It is stated there "Half-breed."

1745. It is 77 hours at 50 cents. Would that be hours you worked or the lady worked?—There was a time they paid them by the hour, and sometimes by the folio. It was sometimes one and sometimes the other. I have seen some Departments pay by the folio and some by the hour. There was no regular rule of pay, either by the hour or by the folio.

1746. Look at this account. It is for 77 hours at 50 cents. Was that work done at your house?—Every bit of the work of that sort was done at my house.

1747. There was no check on these hours, except your own?—I was the one who had to tell Mr. Côté that it was honestly and faithfully done.

1748. Suppose you did half of it yourself. What check was there on you?—I always try to speak the truth.

1749. What check was there on you? Did this C. Gordon check you?—No. For instance, if she was going to work she would sit down at a certain time and her work would be regular. The clock was there, and I was always around the house. I am always at home at night with my children.

1750. You would sit down and work, too?—I had in a great many cases to do that work, because it was all kinds of handwriting and difficult to read.

1751. You kept account of the number of hours?—A. Certainly.

1752. You could not make any mistake about it?—No.

1753. But you could make a mistake if you chose?—Yes; she might have got \$50 as well as \$38, if there had been an intentional mistake.

1754. There was no check on Miss C. Gordon or you?—None more than giving the Deputy my word of honour.

1755. You took the work and checked the time, and informed your superior officer that it was done?—Yes; of course.

1756. And got the money?—Yes; she always went and got the money herself.

1757. Here is another account for \$36.25, 5th May, 1886: "To services prepar- ing index Half-breed scrip claims, heads." (Exhibit No. 14.) What the meaning of that?—That index was work that had to be done for Mr. Côté at the time they went to settle up matters with the half-breeds—some time after the Rebellion. I do not see any date on it, but it is all 1886. That was index work that was done for Mr. Côté.

1758. Who is Mr. Côté?—He is a first-class clerk in charge of all the Half-breed work—scrip work.

1759. Is he your superior officer?—I forget whether he is a first-class clerk or not. Yes, he is. He is in Mr. Goodeve's Patent Branch. In this case I merely asked Miss Gordon to let me use her name. This work had to be done in the office at night. I think there was myself and another man who were specially qualified to make indexes, and we were told we would be compensated if we came back at night.

1760. You got that money?—In that case, certainly. That index work is not done outside of the building.

1761. 72½ hours' work at 50 cents. (Exhibit No. 14)?—The books are over there, and I should like the Committee to send over and see them. I am not ashamed of my work.

1762. You knew you were not complying with the Civil Service Act?—I was not aware. It was work that did not appertain to my duties.

1763. You did it in your office?—Not in my office. I did it in Mr. Côté's own office. It was not work that either the Deputy or Minister could say: "You must go and do this work by compulsion." I had no acquaintance with it in the day time. It was not a case in which I might do the work through the day.

1764. Why did you not use your own name?—Because it was the custom for permanent men not to get paid for extra work.

1765. The custom must have had some sanction?—In the time of Mr. David Mills I did a good deal of extra work.

1766. But the Civil Service Act was passed in 1882?—Custom grows, however, and custom becomes second nature.

By Mr. Denison:

1767. Was it done in other names, then?—It was the custom for permanent men to get extra pay.

1768. The money would not be paid in his own name?—No; the money was not paid in his own name.

By Mr. Somerville:

1769. But it was not contrary to the law?—If it was not contrary to the law why did they do it? It was the custom. I say that if a man did any extra work and the Minister wanted it done he was compensated in the name of some relative.

1770. That was the understanding with the Minister?—At that time I think it was. I think the Minister knew as much of what went on as anybody else.

1771. Was that prior to 1878?—Yes; I did work for the Privy Council then many times. I mean to say, that the thing grew out of a regular practice.

By Mr. Barron:

1772. You forget that the Statute came in between and prohibited it?—No; I speak as a man of some education. If I am employed, say in the Finance Department, to do a certain work in the day time and another work at night, that does not appertain to my office duties. It is special work, which does not attach to my office. I have been doing extra work for years and getting nothing for it.

By Mr. Chrysler:

1773. Is that oath taken by all the extra clerks, as well as the permanents?—I believe it is.

1774. That oath is taken by everybody who works there, and is not intended to be the same in extent as the Act itself?—No.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.—Mr. Burgess, do extra clerks take that oath?

Mr. Burgess.—Yes.

By Mr. Chapleau:

1775. You state that at times extra work was paid by the hour and at other times by the folio?—Yes.

1776. You said there was a period at which it was paid both ways. What do you mean by that?—I mean in the period away back. In the time of Mr. Hims worth, of the Privy Council, he gave me some work in preparing indexes for his Department. He paid me by the hour, as there were thousands of figures in the index and the work had to be done with perfect accuracy. If you give a person clear printed work, for example, it is easy to count it.

1777. You did not mean to say that it was paid both by the folio and by the hour?—There were not two payments.

1778. How long have you been in the service?—Since 1870. I became an extra clerk in 1870, and a year after that I was made permanent by Sir John Macdonald, who put me in the Ordnance Office. It was the Queen's Printer's Office.

1779. Since how long have you been a second-class clerk?—I was promoted to a second-class clerkship in 1878. I was at the maximum in 1884, and have not received any increase since.

1780. The custom which you spoke of, and which, in your opinion, was second nature, as you put it, was it prevailing in the Department since 1870?—Of giving extra work to permanent men?

1781. Yes.—They used to do it. I used to get extra work in the time of Sir Richard Cartwright, when he was Minister of Finance. There were men who were first-class clerks engaged then in destroying notes. It was confidential work. They would come on at 7 o'clock in the evening and work until 11 or 12.

By Mr. Taylor:

1782. Did they draw the money in their own name?—Their own.

By Mr. Somerville:

1783. There was no necessity for their trying to evade the law?—No; because it was not considered wrong. It was considered right for a man to improve his time, just as men in the Civil Service use their time for literary work.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant) :

1784. Was the account made out in your own name or anybody else's in the time of Sir Richard Cartwright?—There was just a pay-sheet.

1785. Was the pay sheet signed in your name, or was it signed in the name of some person else?—I do not think so.

1786. Do you believe that prior to the passing of the Civil Service Act any extra work you did was paid for in the name of any other person?—It may have been. I did not get any in my Department since. It was only subsequent to the death of my brother in the North-West.

1787. Why did you say this custom grew out of a custom which had prevailed in the Department prior to the passing of the Act?—I think I stated what was quite right—that in the time of Mr. Mills I did one or two little jobs and got paid for them, but not in my own name.

1788. You did work in the time of Mr. Mills and were paid, not in your own name?—Yes; I was paid in the name of my sister-in-law. She was helping me.

By Mr. Barron :

1789. In the case of Mr. Mills she did extra work?—Yes; we both did the work.

1790. And it was in her name the account was put?—Yes; it was work for the Ordnance Lands Office.

1791. At that time there was no law against that sort of thing?—I never followed that sort of thing.

1792. When you say the custom was kept up, the same custom as formerly, that is not exactly the case?—I think you misunderstood me. I said there was not a custom at all allowing permanent clerks to get extra work. Of course, there might be a number of cases, but I could not answer for them.

1793. When permanent clerks got extra work they got paid for it in their own names in Mr. Mills' time?—Yes.

1794. Not in anybody else's name?—No.

1795. Did you never see the statute upon this?—I read it; but it did not interest me very much.

1796. I want to point out to you what the statute says. It says: "No extra salary or additional remuneration of any kind whatsoever shall be paid to any Deputy Head, officer or employé in the Civil Service of Canada, unless the same has been placed for that purpose, in each case, in the Estimates submitted to and voted by Parliament." You see that statute is somewhat different from the oath, and prevents you from even doing extra work when it is in another Department?—I don't know, sir; I might argue that point—I think it is possible to do it. A certain sum of money is voted indirectly to cover extra work; I think this covers the case.

By Mr. Taylor :

1797. I understood you, whether correctly or incorrectly, to say that during the time of Mr. Mills you had done some work in which your sister-in-law assisted you?—And got paid—yes.

1798. In whose name was it paid?—I got the pay in her own name, as well as my memory serves me.

By the Chairman :

1799. I understood you to say that the work was done jointly by you two, but it was paid in the name of your sister-in-law?—We both did the work and it was pay for her for work we did.

By Mr. McGregor :

1800. She got the money, did she not?—Yes.

By Mr. Bowell :

1801. You got the work for your sister-in-law, you assisted her in doing it, she drew the money for the work which the two of you did in your own house?—Certainly.

By Mr. Chapleau :

1802. The work was for her?—Yes.

1803. And you said that in a certain manner the extras were to compensate you for your brother being killed in the North-West?—We had a great deal of trouble and loss and expense. I acknowledge that I merely used my sister-in-law's name because, according to custom, I could not get it otherwise; but I did the work, and I would have made it out in my own name, but it was not the custom, and probably the Auditor General would not have allowed it to pass.

The Committee then adjourned.

COMMITTEE ROOM, WEDNESDAY, 29th July, 1891.

Committee met—Mr. SPROULE in the Chair.

A. P. SHERWOOD called, sworn and examined:—

By Mr. Somerville:

1804. You are chief of Dominion Police?—Yes.

1805. You have certain duties to perform with regard to the keeping of the time of the men going in and out of the Departments?—Going in and out of the buildings. Anybody going in after hours, before 7 in the morning or after 6 in the evening, has his time taken, and unless he is on the pass list of the Department he is not allowed in.

1806. What do you mean by pass list?—An order from the Deputy Head to go in.

1807. Can you turn up your books and tell me whether Mr. B. H. Humphreys had an order of that kind from the 15th December, 1888, to the 1st of May, 1891?—I cannot go back to 1888, as the information I was asked to give was from the 1st of July, 1889, to the 30th June, 1890. I have brought my books with me.

The examination of Mr. Sherwood was suspended, to enable him to procure the information asked for by Mr. Somerville.

H. E. HUME called, sworn and examined:—

By Mr. Somerville:

1808. What position do you occupy in the Interior Department?—I am a second class clerk?

1809. What is your salary?—\$1,100.

1810. You are private secretary to Mr. Burgess, are you not?—I attend to his personal correspondence?

1811. What does that mean?—I wrote his letters.

1812. You were called private secretary, were you not?—No, sir; there is no office of that name.

1813. But you discharged the duties of that position?—I was Mr. Burgess' correspondence clerk.

1814. Did you ever receive any extra pay for services in the Department?—I have received extra pay.

1815. When?—In the spring of 1887 I received a payment.

1816. Of how much?—\$50.

1817. From whom?—I received it through a clerk named Hastings.

1818. Do you see that account, Mr. Hume (producing account). Is that the money you got?—Yes, sir; I received part of this account.

1819. How much of that did you receive?—\$50.

1820. By whom is that account made out?—I wrote the account myself at Mr. Hastings' request.

1821. And you certified it as correct?—I certified that it was correct.

1822. You got the money?—I received a part of the money.

1823. Who instructed you to do this?—I received instructions to do it, but I do not think it is quite fair to say right out who told me.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.—I think it is right that you should tell every thing you know. You cannot inquire of anybody here. You are sworn, and you must give the evidence.

Mr. FOSTER.—You must answer.

By Mr. Somerville:

1824. Who instructed you to do it?—The Deputy Minister instructed me.

1825. How did he come to instruct you; how did he come to tell you to make it out?—He said to me one day that I might have extra pay for certain special services I rendered.

1826. That you had rendered?—Yes.

1827. What were these special services?—In the first place, I wrote out for him his evidence concerning a certain case in which he was examined—a certain land case. A commission was issued to take his evidence, and I wrote some of his evidence for him. There was also work in connection with the preparation of the annual report, which I did over and above my ordinary duties.

1828. When did you do this?—Which do you mean?

1829. This extra work?—At different times previous to this account.

1830. Did not Mr. Hastings do any work?—He did work I think to the value of \$8.

1831. In that account?—Yes.

1832. The account is for \$58. (Exhibit 15). I see it is extra work since the 15th December, 1886, 85 hours at 50 cents, and then extra work on the annual report, 31 hours at 50 cents. Who did the first part of this work, you or Hastings?—I think that includes the \$8 worth of work which Mr. Hastings did—that first item. The second item is for work which I performed.

1833. Were you doing right when you certified to that account for yourself?—I certified that the work had been performed. I knew that it had been performed. The Deputy Minister was satisfied with my certificate that the work had been performed.

1834. Did he instruct you to make out an account in that way?—Yes, sir.

1835. Here is another account (Exhibit 16) of the same character. Do you know anything of that?—Yes, sir; I think I remember about this account.

1836. What do you remember about it?—I received the proceeds of that account.

1837. Made out in the name of S. J. Hastings?—Yes, sir.

1838. What circumstances led up to your receiving this?—The circumstances were, as far as I can remember, exactly the same as in the other case.

1839. Who has certified to that? That is not a certificate at all, is it?—That is an endorsement in the Accountant's office.

1840. Is that account certified to?—It is not certified.

1841. Not by anybody?—No, sir; it is approved by the Deputy Minister and not certified.

1842. Is it not necessary to have an account certified? Is that not a rule of the Department?—I am not in a position to say whether it is a rule of the Department or not. Accounts are usually certified. I have no doubt it was an oversight that it was not certified.

1843. At all events, you received the money?—I received the money.

1844. Here is another account (Exhibit 17). What about that?—This account is dated the 1st August, 1886. I remember about that to a certain extent.

1845. What about the circumstances connected with it?—I remember simply that I did not receive any part of that account; that it was paid to Mr. Hastings for work done by him. That is so far as my recollection goes.

1846. You certified to that?—Yes, sir; I certified.

1847. But in that case you say Mr. Hastings did the work?—My recollection is that that account was put in by Mr. Hastings for work he did himself, and he received the proceeds of the cheque.

1848. You are positive about it?—That is my recollection.

1849. You are positive you did not get that account or any portion of it?—It is so long ago I cannot be positive; but I can swear that to my recollection I received no part of that \$10.

1850. \$58 was the first account. You received all of that?—No, sir; I received \$50 of that.

1851. The second account was \$15 and this is \$10. You say you are a second-class clerk?—I was at that time a third-class clerk.

1852. You are a second-class now?—I am now.

1853. Did you ever read the Civil-Service Act?—Yes, sir.

1854. Read that clause.—(Reads the clause in relation to extra salary or remuneration).

1855. Don't you think that is pretty plain? Is that not *very* plain?—My idea always was that the Civil Service Act was intended to prevent civil servants from receiving pay from outside persons. It is possible that a man might be offered money by an outsider for having attended to business for him. I understood the Civil Service Act to apply to payments of that kind.

By Mr. Foster :

1856. For work done in or out of hours?—I understood it to be for work properly belonging to the office; that any person offering pay to a clerk other than his salary, the clerk should not receive it.

By Mr. Somerville :

1857. Did you ever certify to any other accounts for other extra men?—I have certified to an account of Miss Armstrong's—Miss E. M. Armstrong. She did some typewriting work for the Department and I certified to it.

1858. There was another Miss Armstrong—a Miss C. Armstrong?—I do not know her.

1859. Do you know Miss C. Armstrong?—I do not know her.

By Mr. Taylor :

1860. For these three accounts—\$58, \$15 and \$10—that were received by Mr. Hastings and of which you received a part, there was work actually performed and services rendered to the value of these amounts for the Government?—Yes, sir; I performed the work to the extent to which I received payment.

By Mr. Foster :

1861. Is Hastings an extra clerk?—Mr. Hastings was an extra clerk.

By Mr. Chrysler :

1862. When did you become the secretary or clerk of Mr. Burgess. How long have you been acting in that capacity?—Since October, 1886; that is to say, I have been working for him since that date, but I took the place of his clerk in 1889.

1863. Whom did you replace as his clerk?—Mr. Chisholm.

1864. At what date in 1889?—About the 1st May.

1865. Take this first account of the 12th August, 1886, of \$10. Were you Mr. Burgess' clerk at the time that work was done?—I received no part of this account.

1866. On the 30th June, 1886, were you his clerk at that time?—I was doing work for him.

1867. But you were not his clerk?—No, sir.

1868. And the work that is referred to there is it in the case of *Mercier vs. Fonseca*?—Yes.

1869. Do you know whether that was gone into—he was called as a witness in his official capacity?—I don't know whether he was called in his official capacity or not, but I presume that the work was such as would come within his office.

1870. All these accounts, then, were anterior to the time that you became his special clerk?—Yes, sir.

JOHN MASON called, sworn and examined:—

By Mr. Somerville :

1871. What position do you occupy in the Interior Department?—I am employed in the storeroom.

1872. Were you the carpenter?—I am a carpenter by trade.

1873. You had carpentering work there?—I did carpentering work there in my spare time, when I am not employed in the stores.

1874. Are you employed steadily in the Department all the year round?—Yes, sir.

1875. What was your salary last year?—\$730.

1876. What are your hours supposed to be?—From 8 to 5.

1877. Are you constantly employed in the Department?—Constantly.

1878. You have work there all the time?—All the time.

1879. Do you ever do any outside work for outside parties?—Sometimes.

1880. Have you done any lately?—Not lately.

1881. When did you do the last?—I suppose about three months ago.

1882. Whom did you work for then?—Mr. Dewdney; I did some extra work for the Minister.

1883. Where did you do it?—I did it in the building.

1884. What kind of work was it?—Screens for mosquito blinds.

1885. How many screens did you make?—Altogether, I think about eight.

1886. Eight mosquito screens?—That is two years ago.

1887. Where did you get the material for that?—I bought it.

1888. What other work have you done?—I put up a shelf or two.

1889. You put up some shelves—when?—A couple of years ago.

1890. When did you do this work?—I did it in my own time.

1891. After hours?—Yes.

1892. You entered the building after hours?—I was there in the building late at nights and early in the morning, and I had my son helping me. He is a carpenter, and I had him to help me.

1893. Where did you get the lumber?—Bought it.

1894. You carried it to the Department?—I brought it into the Department. I made a wardrobe and bought all the stuff.

1895. Have you the bills for that stuff?—I have the bills for the cedar.

1896. You have the bills?—Certainly, the bills that I paid. Whatever I bought I paid for, and Mr. Dewdney paid me.

1897. When did Mr. Dewdney pay you?—I think the last bill he paid me was in the first of the new year—1st of January.

1898. Have you got any pay from Mr. Dewdney since?—Not one cent.

1899. You had leave of absence, had you not, in 1890?—I had, sir.

1900. How long?—I think it was six or ten days, I forgot which—six days I think.

1901. Not longer?—It may have been ten.

1902. Was it no longer than ten?—No.

1903. Are you sure?—Certain.

1904. It was not five weeks?—Five weeks—no.

1905. You are positive?—Positive; can swear to it upon my oath. I swear positively.

1906. How did you put in your time during your leave of absence?—Working for Mr. Dewdney; six days would finish all the work that was done there.

1907. You spent your leave of absence working in Mr. Dewdney's house?—I was working at my own place, not Mr. Dewdney's. My son was in the buildings. If there was rush at the stores my son was in the place during my leave of absence.

1908. Then your son had a salary?—No, sir; not but what I paid him.

1909. It was not leave of absence at all, then?—Mr. Hall told me I would have to attend to the stores; that I would have to see to the boxes to go away, and I had to see to that, and if I was away my son was there doing this work.

By Mr. Foster :

1910. Your son is a carpenter?—Yes, sir.

By Mr. Somerville :

1911. Now, did you ever make any meat safes in the Department for Mr. Dewdney?—I made a meat safe.

1912. When did you do that?—I did it in my own time; it took me perhaps, to make that meat safe, over six weeks. I entered the building at 6 o'clock in the morning and I had two hours then. I have never received a cent in my life since I have been engaged with the Government, and I have been engaged since 1858.

1913. You never received a cent for what?—Over and above my pay.

By the Chairman :

1914. It is desired to know whether you used in doing any of this work the time you ought to be at Government work?—I may have; I won't swear; I may have taken an hour or so. There was one time I could not help it. My son was working with me there at the time and I think I took an hour for the purpose of gluing on some cedar.

By Mr. Foster :

1915. Your son was working for you at this time?—Yes; he was backwards and forwards all the time, so that it would not interfere with my own work.

By Mr. Somerville :

1916. Is it not a fact that you had not a great deal of work in the Department, that you had lots of idle time?—I might say as a general rule I have so much to do I do not know what to take up first. I have always jobs on hand that I can take up.

1917. Did you do any work for Mr. Dewdney this spring?—I did.

1918. What did you do?—This spring I made a couple of boxes and a mosquito frame?

1919. How many frames?—One.

1920. In whose time did you do that?—In my own time.

1921. You are positive about that?—Yes.

1922. This did not need any special gluing, and you did it in your own time?—

I did.

1923. Do you know a man named George V. Yorke?—I do.

1924. Where is he now?—I am sure I cannot tell you. In the States—at least, in Toronto.

1925. Do you know a man named Donovan?—Yes; that is the man I got to take the things to the Minister's house when I had made them. I paid him for doing that.

1926. When was the last payment the Minister made to you?—On the 1st of January.

1927. Did he not send you a cheque about the 1st of May last?—That was the last.

1928. I thought you said the 1st of January?—It was the 1st of January, I think.

1929. Did he not send you a cheque in May this year?—I think not.

1930. Are you sure?—I do not recollect it. The last cheque sent to me I think was in January.

By Mr. Mulock :

1931. What was the first job you did for Mr. Dewdney?—I could hardly tell you. I think it was putting up a little shelving.

1932. Where?—At his house, when he first went there.

1933. By whose orders did you do that?—Mr. White asked me if I could do a little extra work in my own time for the Minister, and I said I did not know. I said: I cannot see my way clear at present, but will see you again. I concluded that I could manage to do this little job, with the assistance of my son.

1934. How long is that ago?—About three years ago.

1935. The first job was putting up shelving in Mr. Dewdney's house?—A little shelving.

1936. How much did he pay you for doing that?—I could not say. I have not got the bill here. It is a very small account.

1937. When did he pay you for that?—I suppose about 6 or 8 months after.

1938. How did it come to run so long?—Because I never put it in.

1939. When did you put in the account?—I have not the date with me.

1940. You did put it in, did you?—I did.

1941. Seven or eight months after the work was done?—Yes; to the best of my recollection, but I do not remember the amounts.

1942. You do remember that you were paid?—Yes.

1943. By Mr. Dewdney?—Yes.

1944. Personally?—Yes.

1945. Where?—It was a cheque on the bank.

1946. Did that cheque include other work?—I think he gave me two or three cheques together.

1947. First of all, he gave you one for the shelves?—Yes; and perhaps for some other little work.

1948. What else would it include, if it included more than the shelves?—I made a table.

1949. That was the next work for him?—I would not say it was the next.

1950. What kind of a table was it?—A table for the kitchen.

1951. Was that the next work you did?—Yes.

1952. How long was it after you had made the shelving that you made the table?—It was soon after.

1953. A week, or two or three weeks?—It might have been a fortnight after.

1954. Within a fortnight, or soon after you put up the shelving you made a kitchen table?—Yes.

1955. Where did you make the table?—In the building.

1956. In your shop?—Yes.

1957. Where did you get the material from which you made the table?—Where did I get the material? I brought it from home.

1958. You remember that well?—Yes.

1959. You had the exact timber required?—Yes; I have lots of timber at home; I brought it down.

1960. I suppose there were other things required. Where did you get the nails?—I bought the nails.

1961. And the tools?—They were my own tools.

1962. You have a complete set of tools apart from the Government's?—The Government has no tools.

1963. When did you get paid for the table?—I could not say the date.

1964. How long was it after the table was made?—I could not say that; some months after.

1965. Was the price of the table included in the cheque for the shelving?—Yes.

1966. Did that cheque cover just those two items?—It covered other things.

1967. What else did you do for Mr. Dewdney?—There was a plate rack.

1968. You made that in the buildings, too?—Yes.
1969. What was the price of the plate rack?—I could not say.
1970. What was the price of the table?—I could not tell you that even.
1971. Have you no idea?—I have not.
1972. Have you no idea of the price of the plate rack?—It is on the bill I gave to Mr. Dewdney.
1973. Was that included in the first cheque he gave you?—I think it was. Those are about the first items I did.
1974. What was the next item you did?—The next was this wardrobe I spoke about.
1975. That is the work that took six weeks to do?—Yes.
1976. What was the price of the wardrobe?—I forget that.
1977. Have you no idea?—I forget.
1978. You have no idea of the price of the wardrobe?—No.
1979. You have not the faintest idea?—Not just now.
1980. \$50?—No.
1981. \$10?—About \$30 or \$35, I should say.
1982. So you have an idea. Did that go into the first cheque?—Really I could not tell you.
1983. Now the second cheque was not included in that?—I think I had only three cheques altogether.
1984. What was the next work you did for Mr. Dewdney?—I do not know; that very near finished it.
1985. Oh, no. We have the mosquito nets. What was the next in order of time? You have to go over two other cheques yet. He would not give you other cheques for nothing. I suppose it simply means this: that you were doing little chores for Mr. Dewdney?—I kept no regular account.
1986. And you cannot now with accuracy give us details of the account?—No. I did not keep an account.
1987. It simply means that from the time of Mr. Dewdney being Minister of the Interior until now you have been doing work off and on for him in the way you have mentioned?—Yes; but I have not done anything for him for the last three months.
1988. And you have been paid out three cheques?—I think it is about that.
1989. During all this time you have been in the public service?—Yes.
1990. Drawing pay at what rate?—\$2 a day.
1991. For how many days in the year?—365.
1992. You have been paid for 365 days in each year since Mr. Dewdney became Minister?—Yes.
1993. And occasionally you got leave of absence from Mr. Dewdney?—Not occasionally; never but once in my life.
1994. Mr. Dewdney gave you leave of absence once?—Mr. Dewdney did not. I asked Mr. Hall. I said I had a little private work to do and I would like leave of absence. He said: "I do not see how we can spare you; the goods must go away." I said: "I will attend to that; if I am not there my son will be there and see that everything is all right."
1995. You got leave of absence from Mr. Hall to do private work?—Yes.
1996. What private work?—Mr. Dewdney's work.
1997. You did it for Mr. Dewdney?—Yes.
1998. And delivered it to him?—Yes.
1999. He knew you were doing it?—Yes.
2000. During the time you were off duty you got your son to take your place and drew pay from the Government?—Yes.
2001. Your son does extra work?—He does not.
2002. What is your son's name?—John.
2003. And your name is John?—Yes.
2004. I see there is a payment here to S. J. Mason. Is he not your son?—No.

2005. Your name is John Mason, "packer, 365 days, at \$2 a day, \$730." That is what you have received?—Yes.

By Mr. Foster :

2006. During the last three years, which have been in question, you have had leave of absence for how long?—I think it was 6 or 10 days.

2007. Is that all?—That is all I have had since I have been in the employ of the Government.

2008. Why did you get this leave of absence?—I had this little private work to do, and I did not see my way clear to do it; but I thought if I could get leave for a few days, then I could do it.

2009. Whom did you ask?—Mr. Hall.

2010. What did he say?—He told me, he says: "I will give you leave, John, but I do not see how we are going to do without you; goods are going away every day." I said I would see there would be no delays, as my son would be there in case I could not be.

2011. You got your 6 or 10 days' leave?—Yes.

2012. And during that time your son was engaged in your place?—Not all the time; every time there was work to be done he was there.

2013. That work that you would have done was done by him?—Yes.

2014. Did he receive pay for it?—I paid him.

2015. I mean from the Department?—No; not at all.

2016. He received no pay from the Department during the time he was at work while you had received leave of absence?—Not one cent.

2017. Did you do this work for Mr. Dewdney in office hours or out?—I may have used a few hours in office hours.

2018. How many?—Not a day altogether.

2019. All the rest was done outside of time?—Yes.

2020. And for everything you did Mr. Dewdney paid you?—Yes; as I sent in my bill. I paid for everything I used.

2021. The material you used for these articles you bought and paid for yourself out of your own money?—Yes.

By Mr. Somerville :

2022. You wanted this special leave of absence at this time to do work for Mr. Dewdney?—Yes.

2023. Did you have any conversation with Mr. Dewdney about it?—I did not.

2024. Mr. Dewdney asked you to do the work?—No, sir; Mr. Fred. White came to me and asked me if I thought I could do this work for Mr. Dewdney. He wanted this work done.

2025. Who is Mr. White?—Comptroller of the Mounted Police.

2026. Is he your superior officer?—No, sir.

2027. He said Mr. Dewdney wanted this work done?—Yes; Mr. Dewdney asked if he could recommend him some one.

2028. When was this?—This was when the Minister first came.

2029. But I mean with reference to your leave of absence?—That is the time I had my leave of absence—the first of the year 1890.

2030. Previous to that, according to your own statement, you had been doing work for Mr. Dewdney?—Not at all. This was the first commencement.

2031. Had you not done any work for Mr. Dewdney before these holidays commenced?—No.

2032. You got these special holidays of six to ten days in order that you might do work for Mr. Dewdney by instruction from Mr. Fred. White?—No instruction. He came and asked me if I could do it. I told him, I did not see my way clear at present, but would let him know again; and I thought that if he was not in a hurry,

and it did not matter how long I took over it, I would do it in my spare time. My son would help me, and I could manage it.

2033. You did this work right along when you got your holidays?—Not at all.

2034. I mean this special work?—I did the bulk of it.

2035. What were you doing during these holidays?—I was working at Mr. Dewdney's house and in the buildings in my own shop.

2036. Hadn't you your son at work in the buildings?—Sometimes I would come there when I was using glue, and so on. I had not that at home.

2037. You were working at Mr. Dewdney's house, and came back when you wanted to use the glue?—I was not at Mr. Dewdney's house when I was using the glue at the buildings.

2038. Certainly not. This holiday was specially to work at Mr. Dewdney's?—Yes.

By the Chairman :

2039. Is it customary for clerks working on the same lines of work as you to get holidays some time in the year?—Yes.

2040. Does their pay go on during their absence?—Yes. The Board of Works gives their men holidays.

By Mr. Barron :

2041. Is it customary to get holidays to do work for a particular Minister?—No

By Mr. Taylor :

2042. How long have you been working for the Government?—More or less since 1859.

2043. And these are the first holidays you ever had?—Yes.

WILLIAM PEART called, sworn and examined:—

By Mr. Somerville :

2044. How long have you been in the service of the Government?—Since the 1st of June 1880.

2045. Where did you reside previous to that?—I was engaged in the Government service on the 1st of June 1880 in Winnipeg.

2046. What were your duties in Winnipeg?—Messenger of the Department.

2047. Of what Department?—The Indian Department.

2048. Who appointed you to that position?—I was living in Winnipeg and I saw an advertisement in the paper for a messenger and I applied and got it.

2049. Whom did you apply to?—The head person.

2050. You were in the service of the Government in Winnipeg from 1880?—Yes.

2051. Until when?—The present time.

2052. But you are not now in Winnipeg?—I was in Winnipeg from the 1st of June, 1880, until the 1st July, 1882.

2053. Were you transferred from Winnipeg to the service in Ottawa?—I was.

2054. How did that come about?—I was transferred by the order of the Minister. When Mr. Dewdney was made Minister I was his messenger in the North-West.

Therefore, he had me transferred from Regina to Ottawa.

2055. You were his special messenger out there?—I was.

2056. You went there in 1882, when Mr. Dewdney came?—I did not.

2057. When?—I left Winnipeg in 1882 and went with the Department when it removed to Regina.

2058. How did you come to get to Ottawa?—On the train, I suppose. I went to Regina in July, 1882, and remained there until the 1st November, 1888, and was transferred from there to here.

2059. What did you do at Regina?—I was messenger to Mr. Dewdney, as he was Indian Commissioner and Lieutenant-Governor.

2060. What were your duties as messenger?—Anything I was asked to do.

2061. What character of duties had you to do?—The duties of a messenger.

2062. In the morning what did you do?—I went to the office and cleaned it out and looked after it. I went to the post office and got the mail and distributed it to the clerks. I worked in the office all day long and put letters on the files and put the files away and copies letters and stayed there until the work was finished.

2063. You had no duties outside of the office?—No; I had not.

2064. You did not do any work outside of the office?—I went up and down with telegrams and posted the letters.

2065. But you did not do any work outside of office duties?—What kind of work?

2066. That is what I want you to tell me?—If you ask I will probably give you the information.

2067. You were transferred to Ottawa in 1888?—I was.

2068. Mr. Dewdney was then Minister of the Interior?—Yes.

2069. Where do you live?—With Mr. Dewdney.

2070. What time do you come to the office here?—On an average at half-past nine.

2071. What time do you leave?—When the Minister leaves.

2072. When does he leave?—Some times four o'clock, sometimes half-past four; sometimes it is five o'clock; but mostly it is half-past six. It is oftener seven o'clock than four.

2073. You are a kind of body servant to Mr. Dewdney?—I am his special messenger. That is what I go by.

2074. You do work down at his house?—I do, certainly. I live there. That is my home. I do no work there except when I am through with the office, before I go to the office and after. That is my home.

2075. If any of the other parties in the Interior Department were to give evidence to show that you were not in the Department more than from one to one and a-half hours per day what would you say?—That it is not so.

2076. Don't you act as general chore man or boy around the residence of the Minister?—I do, but that has nothing to do with the Government whatever.

2077. You wait on the table?—I do.

2078. You black the boots?—I do all sorts of work around the house.

2079. You black the boots? There is no disgrace about that, because I do it myself?—Yes.

2080. You clean the windows?—Yes.

2081. You are general butler or body servant to Mr. Dewdney?—I am, out of office hours; not in office hours.

2082. Will you swear that you attend the office during office hours constantly; do you swear that?—I do, for the most of it, with the exception that when Mr. Dewdney is at the house working I remain at the house as his messenger. Sometimes he is laid up sick and not able to be at the office, and I am his special messenger, and live at the house, and run up and down from the house to the office, and bring his letters and all sorts of documents to be signed, and bring them back to Mr. Hall or Mr. Burgess, or whoever is acting Secretary.

2083. What do you do in the Department?—I am Mr. Dewdney's messenger.

2084. You really work for Mr. Dewdney?—I suppose so. I am Mr. Dewdney's special messenger in the Department.

2085. When Mr. Dewdney travels, do you go with him?—I do.

2086. When he goes to the North-West?—Yes.

2087. What are your duties then?—I am his messenger.

2088. When he gets out on the prairie, what work have you to do there?—There is lots of work. Telegrams and letters have to be sent.

2089. What kind of work do you do when you are travelling with Mr. Dewdney? Tell us without hesitation?—I would rather be asked particularly.

By Mr. Somerville :

2090. When you were travelling with Mr. Dewdney what did you do?—I go out with telegrams to the stations and get letters when there is need of it, and so on.

2091. Does he have with him a Secretary, too?—Certainly.

2092. Who is his Secretary?—Last time Mr. Dewdney went up Mr. McGirr went up, I believe.

2093. And do you get travelling expenses?—Yes.

2094. You get travelling expenses when you are travelling with Mr. Dewdney?—Yes.

2095. How much allowance do you get besides your pay?—I get \$1.50.

2096. When Mr. Dewdney goes into the North-West or into any part of the country do you always attend him?—Well, I have done so, but I have only gone out twice.

2097. Have you ever been in any other part with him?—No.

2098. Were you ever down to the sea coast?—No.

2099. They do not give you such nice trips as that? You draw your salary of \$395 right along, I suppose?—Well, I have done so until the 30th June.

2100. And you get this extra pay likewise when you are off on these trips besides?—I have done so.

2101. Who do you get it from?—From the Department.

2102. Under what name did you get it?—In my own name.

2103. Are you sure of that?—Positive.

By Mr. Mulock :

2104. You are serving two masters?—How do you make that out?

2105. Are you serving two masters?—Well, I am working for Mr. Dewdney and Mr. Dewdney's house is my home, and I am at liberty to do whatever I wish before office hours or after office hours.

2106. Are you serving two masters?—I don't know how you get at that.

2107. Are you serving the Minister of the Interior in his official capacity?—Yes.

2108. You are a servant with the Minister of the Interior in his official capacity, and you are a servant of Mr. Dewdney in his private capacity?—I am.

2109. Then you are serving two masters, are you not?—I suppose so, if you like to make it out that way.

2110. Have you any regular hours of duty to the Government master—the Minister of the Interior?—I generally come down.

2111. I am asking you if you have regular hours for appearing on duty on the Department of the Interior?—Well, the office hours are from 10, I believe to 4; sometimes I am there from 9.30.

2112. Answer my question, sir?—Have you any regular hour for appearing on duty at the Department?—Well, on the average at 9.30.

2113. You say the average is 9.30?—Sometimes before, sometimes after.

2114. Do you sign the roll?—I do.

2115. The roll will show how far you have kept up to that average?—Yes.

2116. You sign it every morning when you are there?—Yes.

2117. It sets forth the hour of your arrival?—Yes; it does.

2118. Supposing Mr. Dewdney required you to remain one hour later than the regular hour for appearing—to remain at your home—which order would you obey—the order of Mr. Dewdney or the order of the Minister of the Interior?—That is not a fair question, I think.

2119. I am asking you a perfectly fair question?—That is not a fair question.

2120. I want to know whether you would obey the Minister or Mr. Dewdney?—

THE CHAIRMAN.—I would like as the Chairman to give him an explanation of it. The witness may not understand, when an order is given by Mr. Dewdney, whether he is acting as Minister of the Interior or as a private individual.

MR. MULOCK.—If he will accept that, I will accept his answer. Is that the case?—Yes.

2121. You don't know whether you obey the Minister or Mr. Dewdney in his private capacity?—Yes.

2122. You told us you drew pay from two sources. Do not you draw pay from Mr. Dewdney for the service you rendered him?—That is private.

2123. Did you or did you not?—I do.

2124. Then you are drawing pay from three sources and you have to render value to Mr. Dewdney in his private capacity for the pay he gives you, do you not?—I do.

2125. You have to give value to him for what he pays you privately for wages?—Yes.

2126. And you try to render value, I presume, to the Government for the pay they give you?—I do.

By Mr. Somerville:

2127. How much did Mr. Dewdney pay you privately?—I am not at liberty—

2128. You are at liberty to tell all you know?—I am not at liberty to give my private affairs in this way.

2129. Who told you that?—I know that—

MR. FOSTER objected to the question being put concerning a matter of a private character.

2130. I want you to tell me who told you you were not to tell?—My private affairs belong to myself.

2131. Who told you not to tell that here?

J. R. HALL re-called and further examined:—

By Mr. Somerville:

2132. You stated I think—I have not got the printed evidence here—that Humphreys got extra work in the Department?—Yes.

2133. And were you aware he had performed extra work?—I was aware, as certified to by Mr. Henry who gave him the work.

2134. Did you certify to this account of Mr. Humphreys'?—Not beyond December, 1888. If you will allow me to explain the matter I think it may probably save time. Humphreys came into the Department in 1883 at \$1.50 a day. Some time in 1885 he commenced doing extra work, for which he was allowed to make about 50 cents a day, to make his pay up to \$2 a day. It was in the month of December, 1888—I was acting Deputy at the time—that Mr. Henry, who had been certifying to this account, said: "Would it not be better to give him 50 cents a day more and put him on the pay list at that rate?" I said, yes. He had been given this for several years and I thought it would be better to put it straight on the pay list and I authorized that and he was paid it. I said to Mr. Henry: "This is to end any extra work for Humphreys. Whether he does it or not, he must be satisfied with the \$2 a day." And since December, 1888, I have not certified to or approved of any payment to Mr. Humphreys. I am told he did extra work on indexing at night and did other work between four and six. That is the principal time he did the over-time. But since the time that I took the stand that he should be satisfied at \$2 a day I have not passed any accounts.

2135. What was there special about this man Humphreys that he should get so much extra pay?—I do not think his salary in any one year exceeded \$1,100, and some years it did not reach that. He was a good all-around man and a good worker.

2136. He seems to have got a good deal more than any other man in respect to extra work. You see, in 1888-89 he was paid for the full year, 153 and 212 days—making up the full year—and then, he was paid for 445 hours at 50 cents an hour, making \$222.50. In the previous year, or rather 1889-90, he worked 365 days, at \$2 a day, making \$730, and he was allowed 776 hours at 50 cents, \$388, making \$1,118. Could that man do this extra work for 776 hours and do justice to the Department by working full time for every day in the year?—He could put in a good deal of time between four and six o'clock. He was an extra clerk, and for extra clerks, between four and six was looked upon as extra time.

2137. You say, this work was done?—It was certified to by Mr. Henry up to the end of 1888.

2138. I am asking what you know about it?—I was not present in the room while he did the work. I accepted the certificate of his superior officer.

2139. You believe, he did this work?—Yes.

2140. Beside having worked 365 days in one year, he worked 776 hours?—I think, that would not be more than two or two and a half hours a day.

2141. And you think, he did that?—I believe, he did. If he did not, I have been deceived, and I am very sorry to hear it.

2142. Who told you that he did this work?—Mr. Henry.

2143. Who else?—Mr. Pereira.

2144. Anybody else?—Not that I know of.

2145. That statement seems to be rather strange in the face of the fact that we have the Deputy Minister's statement, I think, to the effect that this 50 cents an hour, was not for extra work at all, but was given to make up his salary?—I have not read Mr. Burgess's statement.

2146. Was that not your statement, Mr. Burgess?—Mr. Burgess—I do not remember.

2147. Do you know Mrs. E. J. Orde?—Yes.

2148. Who is Mrs. Orde?—She was my sister. She died in the month of June, 1887.

2149. Your salary is \$2,800 a year?—Yes.

2150. Looking through a number of accounts here I see that Mrs. Orde received \$235.60 in 1885?—The total she got was about \$480, extending over thirteen months—the year 1885 and January, 1886. Will you allow me to explain about it?

2151. Certainly.—Before giving that work to my sister I asked permission from Mr. Burgess to do so. There were about twenty-five women in Ottawa getting extra work from the Department at that time. A great many returns were being asked for by the House of Commons, and there was a great deal of copying to be done. This work was copied at so much per folio. The work was done by my sister, or by her eldest boy, a school boy of 15, who wrote a good hand. The money was drawn by her in her own name. I never touched one cent of it in any way. The work was counted up every month by Mr. Wm. Howe, who is since dead. I told him to be careful and count the work fairly, as Mrs. Orde was my sister; he was to be particular to see that it was counted right. One month Mr. F. C. Capreol counted it, Mr. Howe likely having been away. In 1886 the question arose in the Department as to whether we could give out copying to anyone who had not passed the Civil Service examination. Immediately that question was raised I stopped my sister from getting any more work, though dozens of others, who had not passed the examinations, continued to get the work. However, I wanted to make sure that there was nothing irregular, as far as my sister was concerned. For every dollar paid to her the work was honestly done, it was properly counted, and I did not touch one cent of the money in any shape or form. My sister lived at my house; she had five young children, and she did not even pay her board out of that money, in any way. I never touched or received anything out of that money.

By Mr. Taylor :

2152. I want to ask you a question in reference to the work given to Mr. Anderson. I think the impression was left on the minds of the Committee, when Mr.

Burgess was under examination, that he gave out that work. Will you please make a statement of what you know of it?—My recollection of it was that Mr. Burgess came to me one day in my office with the Forestry Report. He said to me: This report is written in such bad English, it is so ungrammatical that we cannot publish it in the Blue Book in its present shape. Whom can I give it to in the Department to revise. I have not time to take it home and do it myself. I at once thought of old Mr. Anderson, a man who had been editor of a newspaper in Scotland for many years, and one thoroughly competent to do the work. He was at that time getting \$1.50 a day in the Department—not very extravagant pay for an ex-editor. I thought that if a little could be thrown in his way no harm would be done. Mr. Anderson took the work home; he did it after hours. It took him five or six weeks to do it. That was in the year 1886. The result of that was published in a pamphlet—not in the report of the Department, but in a separate pamphlet, which was laid before Parliament. In reference to paying him for the work, had old Mr. Anderson come to me direct I would have paid him straight. Unfortunately, however, Mr. Burgess took a round-about way to pay him, and no one regrets it now more than Mr. Burgess himself. There was nothing wrong or crooked about the matter that I can see. Mr. Anderson was an extra clerk at \$1.50 a day. He did the work at night; he did it well, and got \$100 for it. That is all I know about it.

2153. Who is Mrs. Elizabeth Anderson?—I do not know, unless she is Mr. Anderson's wife.

2154. I see that in 1887-88 she was paid \$75. The account is certified to by Mr. Chisholm and approved by Mr. Burgess?—I think after Mr. Anderson's death his widow decided to return to Scotland, and some copying was given to her to help her towards that end. I have no doubt that she did the work. If I am not right in my supposition, probably Mr. Burgess can correct me.

MR. BURGESS—That is correct.

By Mr. Somerville :

2155. Do you know anything about Miss Duhamel's case?—Yes.

2156. There seems to be some mystery about that. I would like to get to the bottom of it?—About two years ago Miss Duhamel, who, I believe, is one of the coming prima donnas, decided to go to Paris to finish her musical studies, and her mother asked that we should not give her a year's leave of absence, but if possible to hold the appointment open for her, if the work could be done in her absence, so that if she failed in Paris she could come back into the Department. That arrangement was allowed on the understanding that it was to be for one year. It drifted on, however, into two years, and all the time, during her absence, the work of an extra clerk, the average day's copying of a lady copyist—I think more than the average—was done for and on behalf of Miss Duhamel. If the parties sent the money to Paris that is a private matter. All that we saw was that the work was done. It was done in a very good hand. The work I have since been informed was done by her sister, but the account has been put in the name of Miss Nellie Myers. Miss Duhamel's sister has passed the Civil Service examination and is entitled to do extra work. I was always under the impression that Miss Nellie Myers actually did the work until yesterday, when Mrs. Duhamel came to my office and admitted that her daughter did the work and that Miss Nelly Myers did not. However, the work was done. It stopped at the end of June, like all those other extra clerks.

By Mr. Barron :

2157. The lady who did the work was the sister of Miss Duhamel who went to Paris?—A. Yes.

2158. In the Department?—No; at home at night time. Those two books which I gave to Mr. Somerville will give an idea of the number of files got in the name of Miss Nellie Myers from day to day. Mrs. Lee happened to have those two, but she generally throws them in the waste paper basket. They are just rough memoranda.

By Mr. Somerville :

2159. The accounts were certified, Miss Nellie Myers signed the cheques, and they were witnessed by some person of the name of Duhamel?—That was probably the sister, Miss Agnes Duhamel—the one who is here in Ottawa.

2160. She is employed in one of the Departments?—I believe so.

2161. What Department?—I think the Post Office Department, but I am not sure.

2162. She would be receiving a salary in the Post Office Department?—Yes.

2163. Did you have any consultation with Mr. Dewdney about this matter?—Oh, no; I have not spoken to Mr. Dewdney about it. I think the arrangement was made with Mr. Burgess to oblige the Duhamel family.

2164. There is such a person as Miss Nellie Myers?—Yes. She has been here ready to be called before the Committee.

2165. She did not do this work at all?—She says now she did not. I always understood she did.

2166. What object was there in putting the account in a fictitious name?—Because the other Miss Duhamel being already employed in the Civil Service could not be drawing other pay, I suppose.

By Sir Richard Cartwright :

2167. Is she a permanent official?—I do not know. I dare say she could have done it.

By Mr. Somerville :

2168. I understand from the Auditor-General that she is not a permanent clerk?—I cannot speak positively about that.

2169. Do you know why the account was put in Miss Nellie Myers' name?—That is a matter between the Duhamel family and Miss Nellie Myers. I know nothing of the arrangement. I was only concerned to see the work was well done.

2170. Did you examine the work?—I have seen specimens of it; it is in an excellent handwriting.

2171. I asked Mrs. Lee to furnish a statement to show the work she did. Mrs. Lee gives out the files every day?—A portion of them.

2172. She ought to know what amount of work is done for this money by the files?—Yes.

2173. She is in a position to furnish to the Committee the amount of work done by Miss Nellie Myers?—Yes. Mrs. Lee has assured me that Miss Nellie Myers, or whoever did the work for Miss Duhamel, did as much or more than the average lady copyist.

2174. I would like to have that evidence here?—You have the primary evidence here already, if you run through those little books which I gave you.

2175. What do the figures represent?—The number of the official files. It may mean that the whole file has to be copied or only one or two papers from it.

2176. Can you give any reason why this other person should be substituted for the real person doing the work?—I know of no reason except that the other Miss Duhamel was employed in another Department.

2177. But that would not be sufficient reason? She is not a permanent clerk?—I do not know whether she is permanent or not.

MR. SOMERVILLE.—The Auditor-General says she is not.
THE AUDITOR-GENERAL.—I am not positive on the point; I am only speaking from memory.

By Mr. Somerville :

2178. The payment of this money has been stopped?—At the end of June. That was the period up to which, by a mutual arrangement with the Auditor-General and the Treasury Board, we were allowed to continue. We gave them all notice in the

month of May that those who had not passed the Civil Service Examination must go at the end of June. That was the outcome of the minute of the Treasury Board on the subject of this extra work.

By Mr. Taylor :

2179. Can you give us a statement as to whether the expenses in connection with the Department of the Interior have been increasing or decreasing for the last two years?—Yes.

2180. Will you please do so?—Yes. I took the trouble to look into that and see whether we have been extravagant, so that I find there has been a steady decrease for the last two years, and a contemplated greater decrease. In civil government here at Ottawa we have made a cut of nearly \$5,000 in the last two years. We estimate between six and seven thousand this coming year, and it will thus be in three years eleven thousand. In 1889-90 we saved \$13,000. We made a reduction of \$13,000 in the outside service, and in 1890-91 we made a reduction of \$11,000; that is \$24,000 in the outside service, besides \$11,000 at the Head Office; and we will make a still further cut. Under Mr. Dewdney's administration of three years we will have effected a saving of fully \$40,000 between the Inside and the Outside Service. But I would like to say right here, and I think it is due to the memory of the late Mr. White, that at the time of his death he had fully made up his mind to make the very same reductions. He spoke to Mr. Burgess and myself about it repeatedly, and would have carried out those reductions had he lived.

By Mr. Paterson (Brant) :

2181. You are making comparison with what year—1885, 1886 and 1887 were extraordinary years?—Yes; those were extraordinary years.

2182. Well, is it a comparison with them?—I said with 1889 or 1890. My first reduction is in 1889-90, the second 1890-91, and I am now entering upon 1891-92, in which we are still going on with this reduction.

2183. Well, in the ordinary course of affairs the expenditure of that Department would be less now than in 1886, shortly after the Rebellion, when there was so much work connected with it?—Oh, yes; for several causes we have been able to effect these reductions; for instance, when the colonization companies were wound up we disposed of Mr. Rufus Stephenson's services at \$3,000 and \$1,000. In the same way we disposed of the Forestry Commission, with \$2,000 salary and \$1,000 expense attached.

By Mr. Somerville :

2184. Was Mr. Stephenson's salary not \$5,000?—\$3,000 salary and \$1,000 expenses. In these two matters we have saved \$7,000, and wherever we have a vacancy in the Crown Timber Office in the North-West, either by resignation or by death, we have amalgamated the Crown Timber Offices and the Dominion Lands Offices. We have done that at Winnipeg, Calgary, Edmonton and Prince Albert, and the salary of a Crown Timber Agent was \$1,200 with contingencies, so there was a considerable saving there. We disposed of the Land Guide service, and in the year 1886 two commissions went out to settle Half-breed claims; and there were expenses in connection with it. All these things are now settled up, and about the year 1887, before Mr. White's death, he began to see his way clear to make these very large reductions which Mr. Dewdney has since carried out.

2185. Reductions have been made because the work was not there to do. That is the reason of the expenses being cut down?—Yes; but if the Government wishes simply to make places for men they could have filled all the vacancies in the Crown Timber Office without any question being raised. They preferred, however, to cut down these expenses if possible, and united the Dominion Lands and Crown Timber Offices.

2186. It is because there was not enough for them both to do, I suppose?—Oh, there may have been an excuse for having two there. It is easy to find something to do for a Government Official.

2186a. Is that your experience?—I have always found plenty to do.

2187. It has been suggested to me that there are many men in the Department who don't faithfully discharge their duties?—There, at the Head Office?

2188. Yes, that there are some men?—Not a great many.

2189. There are some?—I don't know that I am authorized by the Minister to go into questions of internal economy in the Department.

2190. There are some men who do not render much service; would not the Government be doing its duty to get rid of those men who don't give much value?—Here at Ottawa?

2191. Yes?—I know some of them who I think in very few years will have to be superannuated; they are getting on towards that. There would be a still further reduction in our staff at Ottawa.

2192. The other day in giving your evidence you said you sometimes had to go down to the jail to get some of these men out—did you not?—I did.

2193. How did they get in there?—Debt—Division Court.

2194. Division Court debts?—Yes.

2195. And would you go down and get them out.

Mr. FOSTER objected to this question.

J. A. Coré called, sworn and examined:—

By Mr. Somerville:

2196. What position do you hold in the Department?—I am a third class clerk.

2197. When were you advanced to that position?—Since the 1st January, 1887.

2198. You were an extra clerk before you were advanced to the position of permanent clerk, and you were in habit of doing a lot of extra work, were you not?—I did some but not very considerable and I did some sometimes.

2199. Well I see in 1883-84 your salary was \$547.40 and you get \$417.15 extra work?—Yes.

2200. Well the next year your salary was \$547.50 and you got extra work amounting to \$450.50?—Yes.

2201.—That was 1884-85. Well then in 1885-86 your salary was \$547.50 and you got only \$109.25 worth of extra work?—Yes.

2202. How do you account for such a drop as that; you got \$417 one year, and \$440 another year, and then it dropped down to \$109?—Well during the years of 1884-85 the extra work that was put down as having been performed by me, was not in reality performed by myself.

2203. Who was it performed by?—It was performed by a brother of mine who was engaged in compiling an index for the Department and who was working after hours. He adopted this means of getting the pay because I was an extra clerk, and he could not very well draw the money himself because he was prevented, being a permanent clerk.

2204. It was merely a matter of accommodation for your brother?—Exactly, yes.

2205. He got the money in fact?—He got the money every cent of it.

2206. Did he not give you a little share of it?—Not a cent; it was no trouble for me to do that.

2207. You just let him have the use of your name?—Exactly. The thing was customary, at least I had heard in the Department. I did not know there was any thing dishonest about it. The work was done and well done.

2208. How do you know it was well done?—The work is there yet, and if you go over the work you will see it is well done.

2209. There seems to be a difficulty in getting a sight of the work?—I would be very glad to see the work brought here and examined by the honourable members of the Committee.

2210. You did not make out the account then?—I cannot recollect.

2211. Here are some of those accounts. Did you make that out (Exhibit No. 18)?—Yes; I made that out. I might have made out the account and drawn the money and given him the money.

2212. Here is another one certified to and approved by Douglas? Is that your writing (Exhibit No. 19)?—My writing, yes.

2213. And you got no money for that; how much is it?—It amounts to \$42.

2214. How much was the first?—\$51.

2215. Here is another one; how about that (Exhibit No. 20)?—That is one of the same sort I suppose.

2216. Did you make that out?—I did not make this out; it is in the hand writing of my brother.

2217. And certified to by whom?—It is certified to by Mr. Henry. I did not do any extra work at all for my brother, or pass any account in my name for him after 1885, only during 1884, because the work he was at was completed at the end of 1884, and any account that you will find after that date was done for himself.

2218. Well then this account for extra work which was done in 1883, 1884, of \$417.50, you say, all went to your brother?—Every cent of extra work in 1884 and 1885.

2219. And you just allowed him to use your name?—Yes. Of course, I myself performed a little extra work in those days. I may have put in an account, but there is nothing to distinguish now between the accounts filled for my brother as accommodation, and probably a little extra work I did in my own name.

2220. I am speaking of these accounts—you got none of this?—I got none of the money that I received from the accounts that were filled in for my brother's accommodation.

2221. And the total amount was for his accommodation? In these years as I understand you?—Yes.

2222. You knew at the time that you were doing wrong?—I did not. I did not think then I was doing anything dishonest, there may have been something irregular, but I did not think there was anything dishonest or that would in any way arouse any suspicion.

2223. Do you know anything about when your brother did this extra work?—After hours.

2224. Did he do it in the building?—Exactly, in the building and I am very sure he was there every night for over two years. He was working on this index which should be examined.

By Mr. Chrysler :

2225. The work that your brother was doing was the work he could not take home?—No. Not easily.

2226. What was it?—It was a compilation of three different indices into one under the Burr system of indices. It was the indices for different years from 1874 to 1879. They were all made according to the old system of indexing under the first letter, and as the work was increasing considerably in the Department it was very difficult to get at any of the previous correspondence so they thought it a desirable time to complete those indices under the Burr system. The work was long and tedious and required long experience.

2227. As I understand they were the indices to a large number of books?—Yes.

2228. Which could not be conveniently removed from the Department?—Not very conveniently.

2229. Were those books in use during office hours?—They were constantly.

2230. And for that reason the work would have to be done when the clerks in the office were not using them?—Yes.

NARCISSE COTÉ called, sworn and examined :—

By Mr. Somerville :

2231. What is your position ?—I am first assistant in the Patent Branch of the Interior Department.

2232. What is your salary ?—\$1,400.

2233. How long have you been getting that ?—Only since last January.

2234. What did you get before ?—I have been increasing \$50 a year since I was a second class clerk.

2235. You have heard the evidence given by your brother, is that correct ?—Perfectly.

2236. You got the whole of this money ?—Every cent. At the time I was drawing a small salary and had not taken the oath of office, or anything of that kind, although I don't attach any importance to that.

2237. In 1883, 1884 what was your salary ?—In 1885 I was made a second class clerk—on the 1st of January with a salary of \$800 or \$900.

2238. It would be the same in 1884 ?—No, I was a third class clerk then, getting a statutory increase of \$50 a year, so in 1884 I was getting \$50 less than in 1885.

2239. Who was this arrangement made with ?—When I started work, it was made with the then Deputy Minister Mr. Lindsay Russell.

2240. How long did you continue in this work ?—I was engaged in that work all the time I had this extra work.

2241. Two years ?—Yes two, or three years. It was in the fall of 1882 that I commenced the work and it was, as has been explained, upon indices covering the years 1874 to 1879, inclusive, and these books could not possibly be taken out of the office or used during the day, because we were constantly referring to them during office hours and in connection with the correspondence. It was an index of the correspondence received through the Department during those years.

2242. Why don't you insist upon having it done in a square way—having the vote for this extra work put in the estimates ?—It never struck me that there was anything out of the way in it.

2243. You knew about the Civil Service Act ?—I do not know whether I did. I suppose I did. I did not think there was anything really wrong about it. I was not ashamed to tell those who were entitled to know about it that I was doing it. They knew that I was quite willing to put in a good deal of extra time without extra pay, as I have done since ; but they knew that I was not doing all that work night after night from zeal.

2244. Did you know anything of this provision in the law ?—I know all about it now, but I do not know whether I did then. Even in the face of that I do not know whether it would have been an objection as I look at it.

2245. Was it not your duty to look at the Civil Service Act ?—I think it was just in the fall of 1882 that the Act came into force.

2246. Since that time you have been travelling in the North West ?—Yes, sir.

2247. What special business were you on there ?—I was Secretary of the North West Half-breed Commission, but in 1887 I was made a member of that Commission.

2248. Did you draw pay as a departmental officer and as a Commissioner too ?—No, no. I drew just the pay of the Department and the ordinary living allowance of \$3.50 a day. At first I drew \$5 a day because that was the rate allowed to employees travelling in the North West ; but later on that was reduced to \$3.50. I started when the living allowance was \$5, and a special Order in Council was passed allowing me to draw the \$5, as the arrangement was that I was to draw \$5 when I started out.

2249. Did you draw anything else than your living allowance for that service ?—In 1887, after I had performed the service, a vote of \$500 was passed by Parliament to me for my services. That appears in the Estimates.

By Mr. Denison :

2250. Did you draw extra pay before the Civil Service Act was passed?—I commenced doing extra work in the fall of 1882. I do not believe I did any before that. The Civil Service Act came into force about that time.

By Mr. Taylor :

2251. How long have you been in the service?—Since 1878.

2252. For this work that the accounts were put in in your brother's name, you rendered all the services?—I did the extra work. During the day, of course; but I did not do any of that kind of work for which I was paid afterward.

2253. I mean for this index that you did and for which the account was put in in your brother's name?—I did, and I would not do that same work again for twice the money.

2254. The Government got full value?—I would not, if allowed by this Committee, do that work again for twice the money.

By Mr. Coatsworth :

2255. Did you enter the service in 1878?—Yes.

2256. What part of 1878?—I first commenced doing work as an extra clerk, I think it was March 1878. Before that time I had done some work in the Public Works Department. I would like to say that that work could not possibly have been done outside of the Department, and I think I was the only one then in the Department qualified to do the work. I was then assisting Mr. Henry, and I do not think any one but a man familiar with all the correspondence could do it.

By Mr. Mulock :

2257. Were you ordered to do it?—I asked to do it. I represented the necessity for these works, and now these books are being used every day in the Department. We have now to go through these books to see if there was any previous correspondence. The Deputy Minister knew it and the work was certified to by the person in charge of that office.

A. P. SHERWOOD called, sworn and examined:—

By Mr. Somerville :

2258. You have examined the books with regard to the attendance of Mr. Humphreys between certain dates?—The 15th of December, 1888, and 1st May, 1891.

2259. You have ascertained that this statement (Exhibit 21) as prepared is correct from the books?—Yes.

The Committee then adjourned.

COMMITTEE ROOM, THURSDAY, 6th August, 1891.

Committee met;—Mr. Wallace in the Chair.

K. J. HENRY re called and further examined:—

THE CHAIRMAN—Mr. Henry, I understand, desires to make some corrections in his evidence, and also to make a further statement.

MR. HENRY—Question 336, on page 20 of the printed evidence, I should have said that the account was put in under the heading of extra work. It was a difference in Salary on extra work. Question 340—In the sentence, "Henry, if you make out that cheque in favour of Mr. Humphreys, and add an additional hundred dollars, I will approve of it," the "cheque" should be "account." The words "one or two before, for the same sum," should be for two sums, being difference in pay for one year between \$1.50 per day and \$2. Question No. 351—I believe now I should have said that the Forestry Report was a separate report and not part of the annual report. Question 371—I find that in some cases the clerks exceeded the sum of \$9 per week, and I account for it in this way: at the end of the week the work was not in a fit shape to hand over to the next two clerks, consequently they did in many cases exceed the above sum. Question 381—Mr. Hickey may have had his name used by more than one permanent clerk, which will account, I think, for the larger amount which he appears to have drawn; a comparison of dates of cheques and accounts with time-book will no doubt clear this up. Questions 384, 386 and 387—I cannot for the life of me understand why I gave such answers. I must have been rattled, as I often spoke to Mr. Hall, and I also think to Mr. Burgess, that I tried to restrict the clerks to \$9 per week, and that all the staff were on the work excepting Mr. Bell, whom I thought was getting a salary sufficiently large without it, and I may also say that he never appeared anxious or asked for the work. In question 389, where I say 18 men altogether, I find I exceeded the number. I once had that many in my office, but I find that the time-book does not give so many; it should be 16.

STATEMENT respecting payments made to Mr. Humphreys—Difference in salary during years 1887 and up to 1889.

Mr. Pereira and Mr. Hall have both stated in their evidence that I gave Mr. Humphrey extra work and when same was done refused to certify. This is not correct, as any extra work done by him under my instructions was always certified to by me, or in my absence, by my first assistant, Mr. Geo. Bell. The whole amount earned by Humphreys on the Burr Index was between \$80 and \$100, as the time-book, which I now submit, and which turned up since I gave my evidence, shows. The accounts which I refused and which were afterwards certified to by Messrs. Pereira and Bell, were after the \$200 account, and, as I understood it, and firmly believe, were for difference in salary, not for work actually done, but an allowance granted by the Deputy Minister as difference in pay between \$1.50 and \$2 per diem. Each time these accounts were presented to me for certificate I refused, because I thought he, Humphreys, should be paid in the regular way. I also thought, and no doubt said, that if he was paid in that way—the irregular way I mean—there were other clerks in my office who should receive similar treatment, not that I would have certified in their case either, as after certifying to the \$200 account I had made up my mind that accounts of that description would never again be certified to by me. The fourth account was also presented to me by Mr. Hall, and again refused, and I again urged him, particularly as he was then acting Deputy Minister, to get the sanction of the Minister to increase the salary from \$1.50 to \$2 and thus put an end to an irregular and unpleasant matter. This was done, and Humphreys was paid at the latter rate. I desire further to explain the statement made by Mr. Burgess in his evidence, in which he alleges as a reason for my

“supposed” animus towards him, was because he had declined to recommend me for a chief clerkship. Notwithstanding his apology, the statement has gone throughout the public press, and many believe it to be true. Mr. Burgess did promise to recommend me for a chief clerkship, and also informed me what he intended to do for some others in same class; but further said that as Mr. Hall was only getting \$2,400 per year, and to place others who were in same branch in same class, although at the minimum salary, he did not think would be fair, but so soon as Mr. Hall got his pay increased to \$2,800 that my promotion would follow. This was done, and I am still a first class clerk. The late Mr. White, when Minister of the Interior, also promised and assured me that what I was applying for should be given and even when I questioned him closely and said I would need to refresh my memory or in other words, prepare for the examination, his answer was, to do so, as he fully intended to promote the late Mr. Douglas, who was then Assistant Secretary, and myself, to the rank and pay of a chief clerk. I mention this to the Committee to show that I have had reasons for feeling disappointed, but as to having any animus to Mr. Burgess, or having tried to injure him, such is not the case—I feel now, in the interest of myself and family, that I must clear my character from wrong doing. If I have done wrong it is in carrying out the instructions of my superior officers. Some of those who may have “sneered at me as they say, for giving this irregular business away” may live to find out that it is false, and that, perhaps, the chief information which led to its publicity, was worked up by *others*, who did not have as good a reason for feeling disappointed as myself. Further, I deny *in toto* having had anything to do towards bringing about this enquiry, except by answering truthfully the questions put to me by the various members of this Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

K. J. HENRY.

The Chairman read from the printed minutes of evidence that portion of Mr. Burgess's statement, submitted to the Committee on 16th July, 1891, which referred to Mr. Henry's evidence, as follows:—

“I would also take leave to say, Mr. Chairman, in relation to the evidence given by Mr. Henry, that I regret very much that in a moment of anger I should have said anything that would reflect upon him. I prefer to believe and do believe, from what I have known of Mr. Henry during the last 16 years, that he made the statement he did and gave the evidence in the way he did from conscientious motives, and believing that it was his duty to do so.”

By Mr. Somerville:

2260. When was it you had an understanding with Mr. Burgess that you were to be promoted? How long ago?—Prior to 1887.

2261. That has been hanging over ever since?—Yes.

2262. You say that Mr. Hickey's name was used by more than one permanent clerk?—The time book there will explain everything. For instance, there might be two permanent men working on this work, and, of course, the permanent men could not get the pay; but they might use Mr. Hickey's name to get the pay. The work was done in every case, as I have sworn.

2263. I have been trying for some time to get at the bottom of this Humphreys' matter. Can you say who Mr. Humphreys shared with. He got, according to the Auditor General's Report, a large amount of money for extra work—very much more than any of the others—and it was stated that on account of his excellent qualities as a clerk he was paid this extra amount of money. I see he has been sent to Winnipeg and gets \$2 a day?—That was what he was getting in the Department. I do not know what he is getting now.

2264. Do you know whether Mr. Humphreys shares this extra money with anybody?—I cannot say that. For any extra work that he got, and I certified to, I do not know that he shared it with anybody.

COMMITTEE ROOM, TUESDAY, 25th August, 1891.

Committee met—Mr. WALLACE in the Chair.

JAMES S. BROUGH called, sworn and examined :—

By Mr. Somerville :

2265. What is your position in the Department of the Interior ?—I am a second class clerk in the Department of the Interior.
2266. How long have you occupied that position ?—About two years.
2267. What is your salary ?—\$1,200. Since the 1st of July it has been that.
2268. 1st of July of this year ?—Yes ; of this year.
2269. You have been on the permanent staff in the Interior Department, since when ?—Since 1882, I think.
2270. Before that you were on the staff but were not permanent ?—Before that I was in the Department of Inland Revenue. I had charge of a subdivision at Elora, near Guelph.
2271. You have heard or read the evidence that has been taken in regard to this investigation into the management of the Interior Department ?—Yes.
2272. You understand the run of it ?—I do. I cannot say that I have read the evidence through very carefully.
2273. Are you aware, of your own knowledge, of irregularities occurring in the Interior Department—that is extra clerks sharing up with the permanent men ?—Yes.
2274. You know that has been done ?—Yes.
2275. Has it ever been done in your own case ?—Well, yes.
2276. Extra men have shared their money with you ?—Certainly. It was a general practice in the Department.
2277. Will you name the parties ?—Mr. McCabe was one that I did some work with in connection with returns for the House of Commons. The account was of course put through in his name.
2278. You remember the date of it ?—It was during the session of 1889. There were, I think, but two cases ; it was extra work in connection with returns for the House of Commons which Mr. McCabe had to do. As it was work which required two men to do he asked me to assist him and I did so. The work was done after hours—late at night and early in the morning. We were at work by 7 o'clock in the morning, working up to 11 o'clock at night.
2279. Would it be usual for an extra clerk to ask a permanent clerk to assist him ? Would not the practice be the reverse of that ?—That I could not say. This work, however, required two men to do it.
2280. One reason why I called you as a witness was in consequence of a letter which was published in the *Citizen* some time ago ?—Yes ; I contradicted in the *Citizen* a report which had appeared in the evening papers with reference to myself, which was to effect that I got the greater part of \$254, which was a lie. It was not the case at all.
2281. Will you read your contradiction which appeared in the *Citizen* ?—

“ INTERIOR DEPARTMENT INVESTIGATION.

“ *Editor of The Citizen.*

“ SIR,—In the evidence given by Mr. Francis McCabe yesterday before the Public Accounts Committee, as reported by the *Evening Journal*, the following statements appear :

“ In 1889 he (McCabe) got \$254 for extra work. He (McCabe) gave Brough about half the money.”

“ ‘On the whole, he thought Mr. Brough got the most of the money.’

“ Permit me to say that the above evidence, in so far as it applies to me, is wholly false, as I am prepared to testify under oath when called upon to do so.

“ I am afraid the whole of this wretched business is little else than a contemptible conspiracy against those who really honestly tried to do their duty, and have in consequence incurred the ill-feeling and spite of some dangerous and cowardly characters. A few irregularities, caused by an imperfect Civil Service Act, set up in a broad framing of lies, has been presented to the public and has been mistaken for corruption in the Department.

“ Yours truly,

“ J. S. BROUGH.”

“ OTTAWA, July 14th.”

2282. You say now it is not wholly false. You say you did share some of the money?—Certainly.

2283. You swear you did share with McCabe?—In this letter I contradict the statement which appeared in the evening papers. That statement is false. It is a statement that I got half the money or most of the money which was charged against McCabe in 1889. That statement, I say, is wholly untrue.

2284. But still you did get some of the money?—I got in one case about \$16, and on another occasion about \$5 or \$6.

2285. Is that the whole you got?—That is the whole I got.

2286. About \$22?—About \$22. I cannot swear to the exact figures.

2287. Well, I have the accounts here, and they will show?—I suppose so. I can probably help you to get at the figure, to a certain extent. Mr. McCabe was allowed for overtime. He was paid for overtime. He was not able to complete his work within the regular hours, and he was therefore paid for overtime in connection with that work. His account generally ran \$20 or \$22, or somewhere about that every month.

By Mr. McMullen :

2288. For extra time?—For extra time. In the two cases I refer to, where I assisted him, the amounts were entered in the regular monthly account for overtime.

By Mr. Somerville :

2289. Your time was entered there?—Not exactly my time, but it was mentioned in the account that there was an item for extra work in connection with the House of Commons in the two cases. If you hunt up the accounts you will find that that is the case. If you take the total of those accounts and deduct McCabe's average therefrom, which is somewhere about \$20 a month, and divide the remainder by two, you will find what we got in connection with the House of Commons return. I think in one case it will come to somewhere about \$16, and in another case about \$5 or \$6.

By the Chairman :

2290. Were these the only payments you got that year?—These are the only payments; I have never had any others.

By Mr. Somerville :

2291. Here is one of the accounts?—Yes. 1st February, 1889, “ to extra work during the month of January last, entering up action on files and comparing returns called for by the House of Commons—66 hours, at 50 cents, equal \$33.” If you deduct \$20 from that, McCabe's average, it will leave you \$13. Divide that by two it leaves \$6.50. That is one of the accounts I had reference to. (Account filed as Exhibit No. 22.)

2292. You say you only got \$6.50 of that account?—I say I did not get any more; I probably got less. Here is the other account: “ March 1st, 1889: To extra work during the month of February last, entering up action on files and comparing returns for the House of Commons and documents for the Commissioner's office at

Winnipeg—102 hours, at 50 cents, equals \$51." If you deduct from that amount \$20, McCabe's average, it will leave \$31; divide that \$31 by two you get \$15.50, which was about the amount I received. (Account filed as Exhibit No. 23.)

2293. How much did you get from Mr. McCabe altogether—\$22, according to your statement?—About that. I cannot swear exactly to a dollar, but these are the two accounts, and I am trying to help you to get at the actual facts of the case.

2294. I do not think that is in accordance with the official report of the evidence as given by Mr. McCabe?—Perhaps not.

2295. You say you only received \$22 from Mr. McCabe?—I did not say that; I said that was about it.

2296. Did you share with anybody else, or did anybody else ever share with you?—No; he was the only man.

F. McCABE re-called, again sworn and further examined:—

By Mr. Somerville:

2297. Mr. McCabe, you gave evidence before this Committee some time ago with regard to certain matters?—Yes.

2298. You worked with Mr. Brough, did you not, in the Interior Department—in connection with the work of the Interior Department?—Yes; I worked with him some time.

2299. And you shared the money with Mr. Brough after you earned it?—I did for a time.

2300. Here is an account. Look at that account (filed as Exhibit No. 24.) What is the date of it?—This is the 3rd of January, 1889.

2301. And the amount of the account?—The account was for \$37.

2302. How much of that money did you pay Mr. Brough?—I paid half of it, to the best of my recollection.

2303. I want you to recollect it distinctly? You say you paid half of the \$37?—Yes.

2304. Here is another account (Exhibit No. 22.) What is the date of that account?—The 1st of February, 1889.

2305. What is the amount?—That is for \$33. I shared half of that with him, too.

2306. You paid half of that to Mr. Brough?—Yes.

By the Chairman:

2307. The statement by Mr. Brough was that you deducted \$20 for your own over-time? and after that divided it?—There was no such arrangement at all.

By Mr. Somerville:

2308. Now, there is another account, (filed as Exhibit No. 23). What is the amount of that account?—\$51.

2309. What is the date?—The 1st of March, 1889.

2310. How much of that did you pay Mr. Brough?—Half of it.

2311. Are you sure?—I am satisfied I paid half.

2312. You are positive of that?—Yes.

2313. Now there is another one (filed as Exhibit No. 25)?—I would not swear that he got any part of that. I think I got all that myself.

2314. Are there any other accounts that you shared with him before that date?—No, none that I will swear to.

2315. Now Mr. McCabe from whom did you get instructions that you were to share this money?—From Mr. Brough himself.

2316. How did he come to tell you that you were to share it with him?—Mr. Brough stated to me that he was going to work with me and that we were to divide the pay, later on he told me that. I remember he told me that we were to work together and that the pay was to be divided afterwards. It was understood at the time I did the work with him, that he was to get an equal part of the pay.

2317. Did he say who it was understood with?—He told me that it was an arrangement with Mr. Hall.

2318. That you were to work with him and share the money with him?—Yes.

2319. It was generally understood in the Department, was it, that this system was being carried on?—Yes, I think so, as far as I can understand it.

By Mr. Foster :

2320. Do you know Mr. Nelson?—Yes.

2321. Did you have any conversation with Mr. Nelson before you gave your evidence in this room with reference to the subject of this inquiry?—Yes, I had.

2322. Of what nature was it—touching your own evidence?—Well, yes ; it would be to a certain extent.

2323. You and Mr. Nelson had a conversation about what you were going to testify?—Yes.

2324. What did Mr. Nelson say to you?—Well, he at first, so far as I remember, said that he felt that the extra pay was going for extra work and the accounts were made out in the extra clerk's name, and the money given to him and it ended there. He thought the extra pay was given to the extra clerk, and there the matter rested. If I understood him correctly, he said that the Committee had not the power to make him, the extra clerk, tell what he did with the money.

2325. The impression that he left upon your mind was what?—The impression was—well, I did not agree with him, I felt that the Committee had power to make me tell.

2326. Was that all the conversation that took place about this?—I think some time about a week before I gave evidence here, Mr. Nelson came to me, over in the Department of Agriculture, in which I was then working, and talked over the matter again just about what I say. He thought as he thought before, and said, just as he said before, that he did not think that we should tell what we did with the money, and he stated that if we were pressed to tell, if we had to tell what we did with the money, we could say how the money was got.

2327. That is the money you yourself got?—I never distinguished between that money and that which my partner got. The account was for the whole money and we sent it in the general way. I will say this, that he came to me the last time of all and said, so far as he and I were connected in our dealings, that he felt that any work that I did that was in the account—that was put in my name as earned by me, and that if I shared up the money afterwards it was nobody's business. He took pains he said to know that my name did not go down for any other money than the money earned by myself, and if I shared it up afterwards it did not matter.

2328. So that he had two conversations with you?—He had two or three, I think.

2329. Did he ever say to you that you should not tell this Committee that you shared the money with him?—I do not think that he put it in that way.

2330. Did he leave you with an impression as to what he would have liked you to do before the Committee?—Yes.

2331. That you should not tell the Committee that you had shared the money with him on the grounds that it was a private matter?

Mr. BARRON objected.

2332. Did he tell you or did he not?—Tell me what?

2333. Tell you that in giving evidence before the Committee you should not state the fact that you shared the money with him?—No ; he did not say that.

2334. Did he leave that impression on your mind?—Well, the impression that I had was that Mr. Nelson probably thought it would be better I should not tell, but he did not tell me not to tell, more than what I said, that the money I spent, I might say, I spent it in the way young men generally spent money, but I did not just at the time know whether he meant the whole of the money I got or the part I got for myself, and I did not ask him.

By Mr. Taylor :

2335. These accounts are made out for extra work and returns for the House of Commons, are they?—Which accounts, sir?

2336. These accounts which have just been referred to?—These with which Mr. Brough was connected? Two of them are.

2337. Then you and Mr. Brough jointly prepared the returns asked for by the House of Commons?—Yes.

2338. The work was actually done by Mr. Brough and yourself for these amounts?—Yes.

By Mr. Landerkin :

2339. Who is Mr. Nelson—a clerk in the Department?—Yes.

2340. Is he there now?—I don't think so; I think he has been suspended. I might say in relation to that letter of Mr. Brough's, at least the statement that he contradicts in the *Evening Journal*, that that was not my evidence. I did not say I shared \$254 with Mr. Brough, that was wrongly reported, but so far as deducting a portion of those accounts—so far as my getting my usual amount of those accounts, and then sharing half of the remainder with Mr. Brough, that is an arrangement I swear, is not so.

By Mr. Somerville :

2341. Did you give him half in every one of these cases?—Yes.

By Mr. McMullen :

2342. What is your salary in the Department—what do you get?—I am out of the Department now.

2343. What did you get when you were there?—When I was in the Interior Department?

2344. Yes.—\$1.50 per day.

2345. Who got you the appointment?—I got it in the first place from Mr. MacMaster.

2346. Were you promised any extra amount, over \$1.50 per day, for extra work, when you were appointed?—Not when I was appointed.

2347. You had no understanding?—No.

By Mr. Taylor :

2348. You were merely an extra clerk?—Yes.

2349. Mr. Brough was a permanent clerk?—Yes.

2350. And that, as you understand it, Brough's work was done, and the work went in your name as the extra clerk?—Yes.

2351. That is the way it was done. You were extra and he was a permanent clerk, and the account was made out in your name, you having done the work jointly?—We did it together.

By Mr. McMullen :

2352. What was the nature of the work you did with Mr. Brough?—It was comparing official documents in the Department.

2353. Did Mr. Brough do exactly one-half and you the other, or did you do most of the work?—We both worked together.

2354. But the work for which you drew extra pay, did you each do a half of it?—My recollection is this; that I did the regular work that I had been doing, and that Mr. Brough did that during the day, and sometimes after four o'clock in the evening, and we joined in the evenings comparing, and at nights, and after four o'clock in the evening very often.

2355. Comparing the work you did during the day?—Oh, no, comparing other work.

2356. What other work?—Copies of returns for the House of Commons, and copies of files sent to the Commissioner's office in Winnipeg; and then the accounts were made out in my name, and we shared them up. I want to make an explana-

tion with regard to my evidence. I was asked at question 493: "What was the nature of your duties? What work were you employed at?—I was part of the time comparing letters that were sent into the Department with the original drafts." I meant to say letters sent out of the Department, in that case. I might say too, that it has been stated to me by some that I endeavoured to save certain members of the Department, that I tried to save the Department, and it has been stated by others that I was too severe on the Department.

The CHAIRMAN—Never mind that, just refer to your evidence.

WITNESS—The only thing that embarrassed me upon that occasion was the account placed before me certified by Mr. Kinloch. That was something I did not know until that day. I thought on that occasion it would be certified to by Mr. Nelson. I did not know that Mr. Kinloch certified to an account. That was an arrangement done without my knowledge, after the accounts were made out, and I felt it would appear there was some such deal between Mr. Kinloch and myself, which there never was, and I was trying to think what it could possibly be; but afterwards I found Mr. Kinloch certified to one account which was given, but not by myself. I may say further, that if there is any question which any member of the Committee wishes to put to me in regard to anything I did wrong in the Department, other than to allow my name to go in for permanent clerks for extra pay, I would be most happy to give an explanation. When I allowed my name to go in for permanent clerks I did it under the direction of my superior officers, and I never went to a permanent clerk in my life and asked him to share with me. On each occasion I was directed by my superior officer, and I never allowed my name to go in on any of those accounts without the knowledge and direction of my superior officers.

2357. Who were your superior officers?—Mr. Hall is one.—He is the Secretary of the Department.

2358. Who do you mean when you say that you were directed by your superior officers?—When Mr. Brough told me to divide with him, he said it was at the direction of Mr. Hall. When these accounts went through connected with the name of Mr. Palmer and Mr. Henry, I gave it to be understood that I wanted Mr. Hall to know that they were not for me, and when that account went in for \$73.50 for Mr. Nelson, he told me that it was understood that the Deputy Minister had arranged it.

2359. He said the Deputy Minister arranged it?—Yes; he said that he had seen the Deputy Minister and he had decided to allow it.

By Mr. McMullen:

2360. Did you say you did not expect extra pay?—Not at the time the \$73.50 was put it.

2361. Who suggested it to you?—Mr. Nelson.

2362. He suggested that you should ask for extra pay?—No; that I should put in an account for \$73.50.

2363. Who did you share with?—That is the account he shared in.

By Mr. Landerkin:

2364. Have you any knowledge of any other irregularities in the Department? There is one place here in the evidence, No. 511, where I was asked: "I want you to be particular about it and specific as to what you were allowed?—At that time to the best of my knowledge I was drawing extra pay." I thought at the time I was. I was thinking of the previous year. I did not say so for a fact, but I thought I knew it. I say that that winter I was doing a good deal of extra work, and I had expected extra pay for it. I had worked all that summer and all that spring, before I resigned from the Department, and Mr. Nelson was willing to certify to the account for me; but when he spoke to the Deputy Minister about it, it was decided that I should not get extra pay. I spoke to Mr. Hall some time before about getting extra pay or an increase of salary, I said my expenses would be heavy, that I was going away, and that I was taking private lessons, and he said he could not give me any

extra salary: but he said to keep account of the work I was doing and he would see if I could get extra pay. However, I did not get any extra pay.

A. M. BURGESS re-called and further examined:—

By Mr. Somerville:

2365. You were in the room when Mr. Pereira gave evidence as to the extra work he did?—I think so.

2366. That extra work was arranged for by you with the late Minister of the Interior, the Hon. Thomas White?—Up to \$400.

2367. Did you see that the work was given to Mr. Pereira?—I cannot say that I saw the whole of it was given, but I know I saw that a great deal of it was.

2368. In his evidence he swears that he selected the work and took it home, and afterwards when it was done he brought it back and certified to it himself?—He may have certified to it, but I know that a great deal of it was shown to me. What I mean is, that his certifying to it would not prevent me from seeing it.

2369. Would it not be a very unusual thing for a man to perform work and certify that the work was done himself? You would think that a very irregular way of doing business?—Seeing that I was a party to the arrangement, I cannot say that.

2370. Would you not feel bound to see that you got value for the money?—I would and I did.

2371. Did he certify to the account?—He may have done that, but it was always within my power to see the work myself.

2372. Did you in this case see that the work was done?—I did.

2373. In every instance?—It is so long ago that I could not swear that I did in every case, but I know that in many instances I did.

2374. There is an account in the name of Lizzie Evans. That was the name of who?—I said before who I understood that was; but Mr. Pereira has since testified that Lizzie Evans was his own wife.

2375. There is the cheque for that account (filed as Exhibit No. 26). Look at that. The amount is \$49.20. Look at the endorsement on that cheque. How did your name come to be there?—I do not remember. I see that it is paid at the Bank of Montreal, and I must have got the money for it, and sent the money to Richard White in accordance with the arrangement in that letter.

2376. Did you?—I cannot say.

2377. We want positive evidence?—At this date I cannot remember this particular sum being sent, but I know I had to send these sums from time to time as they were earned.

2378. Would it not be a usual thing to sent the cheque to Mr. White?—I cannot really at this time say which I did. I could by looking at my letter books, and by seeing the letter with which the money was enclosed.

2379. There is another account for \$97.30 (filed as Exhibit No. 27). It is dated the 15th September, 1886. Look at that cheque to correspond?—I do not remember it.

2380. Your name is on the back of that?—Yes.

By Mr. Hyman:

2381. Did you get the money?—No; not in the sense of it being for myself.

2382. What is your name on the cheque for?—I have no doubt that Mr. Pereira asked me to put my name on it. I remember having done that for extra clerks who were not known at the bank.

2383. Is your name there simply as to identity?—That only.

2384. Why did you not mark on it "identified"?—I know it was for that purpose alone.

By Mr. Somerville :

2385. And you got the money too?—Yes; it was probably sent to me. Do you mean to me personally? No, no. I do not think so.

2386. The amount is marked paid?—Yes; it was paid to the messenger.

2387. And it was paid to you by him?—Either to me or to Mr. Pereira. This was long ago, and I cannot remember. Generally speaking, I did that for a great many others besides him.

2388. I have looked over most of the accounts since 1884, and I never saw it in another instance?—It is so, nevertheless.

2389. There is another account (filed as Exhibit No. 28) of the 31st of July, 1886. What is the amount of that?—\$47.

2390. Your name is on the back of that cheque, too?—Yes.

2391. Here is another one. What is the date of that?—9th December, 1886.

2392. How much is the amount?—\$87.30. (Account filed as Exhibit No. 29).

2393. Who certifies to that account for the work?—Mr. Chisholm.

2394. Would Mr. Chisholm have anything to do with the giving of the work out?—Very likely. Seeing he was my Secretary at the time, I might have asked him to look over the work when it came back, to satisfy himself that it had been done.

2395. Can you tell us whether you did receive this money?—If I did receive it, I sent it to Mr. Richard White.

By Mr. Hyman :

2396. Well, did you receive it? If you received it, why do you not say so?—I am trying to be as candid with the Committee as I can. I could not certify to each particular account, but, generally speaking, I undertook to send the money to Mr. Richard White, in accordance with the letter which Mr. Somerville has seen, and I did so. Seeing I endorsed these cheques, I must have got the money.

2397. As a matter of fact, then, you got the money and did send it to Mr. White?—So it appears now. But if I had been asked before whether I got cheques or the money I could not have said.

By Mr. Somerville :

2398. You know positively you did send the money to Mr. Richard White?—Oh, yes. I received acknowledgements from him from time to time.

Bound by
Marpell's Press Co-operative
Gardenvale

