

Mr. CHISHOLM. (Inverness). I asked the minister the other day for some information with regard to the dismissal of the caretaker at the Inverness public building. The minister was good enough to promise he would bring down the necessary information before the discussion of the Nova Scotia items.

Mr. MONK. I noted what my hon. friend had asked me in regard to Mr. McLennan. There was a complaint against Mr. McLennan of interference in politics and he was dismissed on that account.

Mr. CHISHOLM. (Inverness). Who made this complaint?

Mr. MONK. The recommendation for the dismissal was made by the defeated candidate, Mr. Gallant, because of his interference in politics. Now that there are investigators named, if my hon. friend wishes for an investigation he can have it.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). I would be glad if the minister would be kind enough to give this man a chance to show his innocence because I am convinced he is innocent, and that he did no more than exercise the right of every citizen. He voted as he saw fit. I am very glad that the minister has agreed to have his case investigated. While I am at this I might refer to another case, that of the general repairer of telegraph lines in Inverness county. He was notified some time ago that he would be dismissed. The minister was kind enough to give him the privilege of having his case investigated. I would suggest that pending this investigation Mr. Kennedy be allowed to remain in his office. If he is innocent I assume that the minister will see that he is continued in his position and if he is guilty it will be time enough for him to be dismissed when his guilt is actually proven. If the minister will be kind enough to allow this man to remain in office until such time as the government's agent will investigate the case I will be very glad.

Mr. MONK. I will consider my hon. friend's request and I think it should be considered. I would like to have some further reason urged for an investigation in the first case to which he has referred. We are trying to make these investigations at as little cost as possible but still there are several of them and they involve considerable expense. Therefore, if my hon. friend will confer with me and show some probable cause for investigation I will be very glad to grant one. As to the second case, I will give my hon. friend's request my best consideration. I do not know the details but I will find them out to-morrow morning.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness). I will be very glad to confer with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would like to understand the plan of the minister not only in regard to this case but in regard to a large number of cases throughout Nova Scotia and the country generally. His plan appears to be to dismiss the official first and investigate afterwards. I would like to know what the result of these investigations will be. Will he restore the official to his former position if it turns out that he is innocent and that the charge laid against him by the defeated candidate is shown to be incorrect? There is not much use in our asking for these investigations if they do not bring about some result, and if the minister will say that it will be his policy to restore a party to his former position if it turns out that there is no ground for the charge, there would then be some purpose in carrying on these investigations. The expense would be incurred for no purpose whatever unless that was done.

Mr. MONK. In case it were established by an investigation that the department had made a mistake I consider that it would be the duty of the government to provide some indemnity in the shape of occupation, at any rate, for the party who had been treated unjustly. That would appear to me to be the fair and just course. Last night I think I established that in 1896 the proceedings were of a far more summary nature and I quoted a number of cases in which the dismissal took place without any denunciation whatever and without any investigation. We have progressed since that time and we have no dismissal, without a denunciation, which the minister has to appreciate, and, if an investigation is found to be, *prima facie*, just, it is granted. We are, therefore, advancing towards a higher civilization. But, if upon investigation, it is established that there has been a failure of justice, I think the duty of the department should be to do its best to make amends to the party who had been dismissed. There is a case to which my hon. friend referred the other night and in connection with which he stated that he had written and had received no answer. I expressed the opinion that I must have mislaid or not received the letter of my hon. friend, but I find that I received it and immediately referred it for information in the department. My organization was not very good at that time, it is not very good yet, but on receipt of the letter I referred it at once to the officers of the department for information. The information was not sent to my hon. friend but I have it at his disposal.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Does the minister purpose to grant an investigation into the case of Mr. Sutherland of Canso, that I wrote him about?