

Mr. HODGINS rose to offer a personal explanation on behalf of Mr. Cockburn, M.P., whom he had met a few days ago. The member for South Grey, during the discussion on an appropriation for the township of Ryerson, had attacked Mr. Cockburn, and that gentleman had informed him (the speaker) that he had written a letter to the member for South Grey with a request that it should be read in the House; and in case that gentleman was absent from his seat, Mr. Cockburn wished him (the speaker) to read it. The letter read as follows:—

HOUSE OF COMMONS,
Ottawa, 20th March, 1873.

A. W. LAUDER, Esq. M.P.P.,
Legislative Assembly,
Toronto.

SIR—In perusing the Parliamentary reports of Ontario, as contained in the *Mail* newspaper of the 18th inst, I was surprised to find that you had been rash enough to attack me in the discussion of an appropriation for the township of Ryerson, by saying in effect—

“That Mr. A. P. Cockburn’s (M.P.) brother was employed by the Ontario Government drawing certain pay for services, &c., and that it was not surprising that Mr. Cockburn had turned Brit again—that he had done well, &c.”

Perhaps you were not then aware that your every utterance in this behalf was false but such, however, is the fact. I have no brother in the employ of any Government, never had, and never asked, directly or indirectly, the preferment of any relative of mine for office or employment. I now call upon you, in the interest of truth and political morality, to make the *amende honorable* by reading this letter to the House forthwith.

Yours, &c.,

A. P. COCKBURN.

He regretted that the member for South Grey was not present. He trusted that after the emphatic denial by Mr. Cockburn there would be no further remarks of the kind indulged in. He might also be allowed to make a few observations in regard to an attack which had been made upon himself during his absence in Ottawa by the member for South Leeds, when an item was up for discussion in reference to the Inspectorship of Prisons and Asylums. It had been stated that the gentleman alluded to as having been appointed Chief Clerk, had been appointed either at his (the speaker's) request or in deference to his wishes. He begged to give that statement an emphatic denial. He had had nothing to do with the Government in regard to that matter. (Hear, hear.) He never knew that there was any appointment of the kind to be made, nor had he ever urged that it should be made, nor had he recommended any one—much less the gentleman referred to. He had had ten years' experience himself in the Government service, and when spoken to by persons he had urged them not to seek such offices. He had never used any influence in regard to Mr. Scoble in regard to the matter, for he would scorn to do it, or to ask any such favours from the Government. He was still further surprised at the remarks made by the member for Niagara, and regretted that gentleman was not present. He (Mr. Richards) should be the last man in the House to charge him (the speaker) with being a servile supporter of the Administration, and of being a party to a job; for when that gentleman was a member of the late Government, it was alleged alterations were made in the offices of the Court of Chancery to make room for a relative of his. He (the speaker) had never believed in that charge, because he had regard for the political honour of the member for Niagara, and a personal regard for his relative. He (the speaker) had never joined in casting insinuations upon honourable gentlemen opposite, and he thought it unfair and ungenerous that such charges as he had alluded to should be flung across the floor of the House. He had been elected to support the Administration, and he was proud of that Administration and its supporters in the House; and he had the honour to represent a constituency which had returned him by a larger majority than most of the honourable gentlemen on the other side of the House had received. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. MACDONALD said that he had not charged that the appointment of Mr. Scoble was made at the request of the member for West Elgin, or in deference to his wishes; but he had remarked that it was somewhat extraordinary that a new office had been created and that a brother-in-law of the hon. gentleman had been appointed to fill it.

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR said that in justice to the young man who had been appointed by him to the clerkship in the Department of the Inspector of Prisons, he must allude to an unfair statement made in regard to him. He was asked the other night by the member for West Northumberland if Mr. Scoble was the person who had inspected the drill sheds throughout the Province. He (the speaker) said he was, and it was then alleged that Mr. Scoble was the architect, which he denied. All that that gentleman had had to do was to see that the buildings had been constructed after the design. It was the bungling Administration that honourable gentlemen opposite supported that put the country to such an expense in connection with the drill sheds. The buildings were after the design approved of by the Government at Ottawa. The statement that Mr. Scoble was the architect had been made to damage him—to let it go to the country that he was an incompetent person. Mr. Scoble had no more to do with the design of the drill sheds than he (the speaker) had.

Mr. GIFFORD admitted that he had been misinformed as to Mr. Scoble having been the architect of the drill sheds; he had only inspected them.

Mr. CAMERON said that nothing that had been said about Mr. Scoble had been intended to reflect upon him personally.

The item was then concurred in.

On item \$6,450 to defray the expenses of inspection of Collegiate Institutes and High Schools,

Mr. RYKERT objected to the appointment of a third Inspector of High Schools, especially as one of the Inspectors was allowed to become a candidate for the House of Commons and was stumping the country while holding office and drawing salary. He believed that a schoolmaster or Inspector of Schools should be entirely free from political feeling. Looking at the time that must have been lost while thus employed, he did not see that as the number of schools had not increased there was any necessity for the third Inspector. The Sheriff of Halton was very properly deprived of the right of being a candidate, and a County Attorney had also been notified to like effect. In view of all these facts he felt bound to move that, while the House concurred in the item, it feels bound to express its opinion that it is highly derogatory to the interest of education that an Inspector of High or Public Schools should occupy a political position, either by candidature for Parliament or by actively engaging in any political contest.

Mr. HODGINS said the hon. member should be consistent, and remember that he himself had actively supported the candidature of the Solicitor of the University, who was paid by fees, and who occupied a similar position in relation to the University that Mr. McLellan occupied in regard to the High Schools.

Mr. DEROCHE contended that three Inspectors were necessary. He did not believe that any Inspector could properly superintend more than sixty-eight schools. Three or four days should be occupied in inspecting each school. He believed that the time hitherto taken up in these inspections was insufficient.

Mr. CRAIG (Glengarry) would like to know how many Inspectors would be necessary if so long a time were taken in each inspection?

Mr. DEROCHE said he had calculated that three Inspectors would be sufficient. As to Prof. McLellan's candidature, he thought that a teacher had as much right to be a candidate as a member of the legal profession or any one else. The fact was that the time occupied by that gentleman in his canvas was not taken from the Government, because the election took place during the summer vacation (Hear, hear.) Mr. Ross, the member for West Middlesex in the Commons, was a School Inspector.

Mr. MACDONALD moved, in amendment to the amendment, a resolution expressing the opinion that as Mr. McLellan had been able to devote a large portion of 1872 to his political contest, there did not exist any necessity for an additional Inspector, and that the salary of the third Inspector be struck out.

Attorney-General MOWAT said the explanation of the hon. member for Addington had rendered it unnecessary that he should further explain the necessity for three Inspectors. The recommendation of Dr. Ryerson on this subject had already been read to