

Mr. McCallum, who was the lockmaster, to be the superintendent of works, and he was instructed to take advice from a certain resident of the township, Mr. Duncan McMillan, with regard to the employment of men. At the end of January he received direct instructions from the department not to apply to Mr. Duncan McMillan, but to Mr. Angus McMillan, with reference to the employment of men and the supply of materials. Instead of doing that, he employed all the same men for the full month of February, without giving any notice to Mr. Angus McMillan. Some of the men who wanted to get work applied to Mr. Angus McMillan, but Mr. Angus McMillan answered that he had no information on the matter, and it was seven weeks afterwards that I thought it my duty to the department to inform the Minister that an officer of his department, who had been instructed to take steps at the end of the month of January, had not done so. Having protected Mr. McCallum against dismissal on political grounds, I thought that he should be dismissed for having, during seven weeks, acted very badly in not acknowledging the duty he owed to the department, and in having disobeyed the orders of the department. It was only by special circumstances that I learned that he had not given notice to Mr. Angus McMillan. After the matter was brought to the notice of the department, he was dismissed on that ground, and on that ground only.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not wish to pursue this further than to say that Mr. McCallum absolutely denies that.

Mr. BOURASSA. I may say that I have the written proofs of all this. I have not them here, but I will bring them to the hon. gentleman at any time he wishes.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Minister anything to say?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I do not know that I have anything to say about it. I have not made many dismissals and I have been justified in making all I have made. In this case a member of Parliament stated to me what he has just now stated to the House, that is, that he had written evidence that one of our officers was disobeying us. I will never dismiss a man because he is a Conservative, but, at the same time, I will dismiss any of my employees who will not obey me, and I think my hon. friend would do the same. I have not done more than that. On the written statement of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that Mr. McCallum had disobeyed the written order to apply for information to Mr. Angus McMillan, I dismissed him, and I am sure the hon. gentleman informed me rightly.

Customs—

Additional amount required to meet salaries and expenses of inspectors of ports and officers on preventive service.....	\$6,250
Amount required for the purposes of defraying expenses of special preventive service.....	5,000
Amounts to be paid to Department of Justice to be disbursed by it and accounted for to it for secret preventive service.....	5,000
To pay John Reid for services.....	200

Mr. WALLACE. I wish to protest against all these items, but especially against the one providing an amount of \$5,000 to be paid the Department of Justice for secret preventive service. My opinion is strengthened by further consideration of this item that it should be struck out. It is an innovation in the customs service which is not justified. As I have already said, it will open the door to practices we are not accustomed to and which will be injurious to the well-being of the country and the Customs Department in particular. It is a well-known fact that enormous powers are given to the Customs Department, because that is the great collecting department of the Government and the revenue requires to be protected. But this is an extension of that power, and the hon. Controller told us he was not going to expend this money but would hand it over to the Department of Justice. That makes the case still worse, because the Department of Justice does not know the customs laws, practice and rulings, and is not familiar with the machinery of the Customs Department for making investigations and of detecting wrongdoing and the requirements for the prevention of fraud against the customs. These are entirely unknown to the Department of Justice, and yet it is proposed to hand that money over to it. I presume it will be manipulated by the Dominion Police. Would the hon. Controller inform the House whether it is to be under the control and management of the Dominion Police?

The CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The Department of Justice.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, the Dominion Police are under the Department of Justice. The hon. Controller might tell us whether the intention is that the Dominion Police shall have the conduct and management of this matter. The Department of Justice has no officers of its own to conduct it. It has the control of penitentiaries and Dominion Police, and the only machinery it can utilize is the Dominion Police, and they are not the parties who should be entrusted with this important work. This will establish a system of surveillance over the importers, manufacturers and merchants, and authorize the expenditure of money to pay men to go into the offices of these people and become familiar with their business, or it may be used to bribe the servants and employees of these men. That appears to be almost