

Mr. LEMIEUX. I was paired a few days ago with the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) by the Conservative whip. I saw the hon. gentleman (Mr. Broder) in the House and as I thought he voted, I voted also.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. member (Mr. Broder) wish to vote now, under the circumstances?

M. BRODER. I vote for the motion.

Mr. KLOEPFER. I vote in the same way for the motion.

Mr. GILLIES. There seems to be a doubt as to the statement I made. In order to make myself sufficiently clear, I wish to say that if I had voted, I would have voted against the motion of Mr. McMullen.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) has not voted.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was paired with the hon. the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), or otherwise I would have voted against the motion of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen).

Mr. RUSSELL. And if I had not been paired with my hon. colleague (Mr. Borden), I would also have voted against the motion of the hon. member (Mr. McMullen).

Rivière du Lièvre—Little Rapids Lock and dam \$4,500

Mr. FOSTER. Before these items are carried, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a matter which I brought up before with reference to the dismissal of Mr. McCallum who was lockmaster and foreman on the Le Lièvre works. We had some discussion across the floor with reference to that matter, and the Minister of Public Works gave a version of the reasons why Mr. McCallum was dismissed. These reasons went upon "Hansard," and Mr. McCallum of course read them. Mr. McCallum takes occasion to question the correctness of those statements made by the Minister—not of course because they were made by the Minister—but that the Minister's information was not correct, and consequently the statements were not as the facts actually were. The chief points of difference are these. In the first place, Mr. McCallum denies that he did anything else than loyally and fairly carry out the instruction that he received from the department. The instructions at first were given to him explicitly, to have recourse to Mr. Duncan McCallum. He had recourse to Mr. Duncan McCallum and to no one else. Then when the instructions were changed, he was told that it was not Duncan but Angus, and after that he was to have recourse to Angus McCallum for supplies, recommendations, and the like. From that time forward he had recourse to

Mr. SPEAKER.

Angus and not to Duncan McCallum. Mr. Angus McMillan, however, took the full interest in it, as he said himself, because Mr. Duncan McMillan did not care very much to be bothered with it, as there was nothing in it for himself. He, however, was employed, even before that time, whilst the patron of the works was Mr. Duncan McMillan. His time was constantly, or almost constantly, employed in carting the stone necessary for the work. This shows that even under Mr. Duncan McMillan, Mr. Angus McMillan, who, I believe, is a good Liberal, was not left out in the cold. The Minister declared that he had dismissed Mr. McCallum because Mr. Bourassa, the member for the county, had asked for his dismissal, and the Minister was of opinion that Mr. Bourassa had gone to the place, had held an investigation, and had found that the facts were in accord with the statement of the Minister, and that Mr. McCallum was untrue to his party. Now, Mr. McCallum denies point-blank that Mr. Bourassa ever made an investigation, or ever visited the works to make an investigation. Consequently, he is in the position of having been dismissed after simply doing his duty, without any investigation, and on testimony which he challenges and declares to be incorrect. Mr. McCallum's friends have asked the Minister, under these circumstances of misinformation, to give Mr. McCallum an investigation into the charges which were made against him by the member for the county, and in the remarks of the Minister whose opinion, I suppose, was drawn from that source, so that he may clear himself of those charges and those assumptions, which he declares to be false. He has sent in, I believe, a largely-signed petition, but not so largely signed as it would have been if he had had more time. What he asks for is simply an investigation. Acting for Mr. McCallum in the sense in which any person outside wishes a member to represent his case here, I mention these matters in order to ask the Minister to grant fair-play to Mr. McCallum and to have an officer investigate the charges. After that, it will be open to the Minister to employ Mr. McCallum or not; but I humbly submit that it is not open to the Minister to dismiss a man under aspersions which would impinge upon his character, and which he denies. It is the right of any man, though he does not enjoy the sweets or emoluments of office, to at least have his character left just as good as it was.

Mr. BOURASSA. The first time this matter was brought before the House I was not present. I have a very short explanation to make. For several months I resisted the pressure of some friends who asked for Mr. McCallum's dismissal from the employment of the Government because I did not care to have him dismissed on political grounds. But during the winter some repairs were made on the Little Rapids lock, and for the sake of economy the department appointed