

Mr. DYMENT. In the one case it is C. W. McRae and in the other it is C. McRae. Then there is Breckman and J. Arnold. That, I think, makes seven or eight of the old hands retained. These are all I see here. There are two others who are not here, who were put on by the superintendent. There were five struck off. The staff was reduced by five. But recently it was found absolutely necessary to put on an oiler at night. So that makes four less than there were last year. These four and the nine still there make thirteen. Several of them, as the Minister of Railways and Canals says, were strong partisans.

Mr. SPROULE. Who ?

Mr. DYMENT. Mr. Brown, for instance, who attended the convention. And when he was asked to support Mr. Hearst, who was a great friend of his, he almost weepingly said: William, I would like to vote for you at this convention, but I must vote for George. George had the patronage. Mr. Williamson is another case. And there is another one who is not on this year, but who held the important position of chief foreman on the canal last year. I took the trouble to inquire in the Marine Department to-day, and I was told by the official in charge that this man was a defaulter to the Government in about \$1,300

Mr. SPROULE. Was that put in against him ?

Mr. DYMENT. I think it is a sufficient reason for not continuing him in the employ of the Government.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it brought to the attention of the Government ?

Mr. DYMENT. As a matter of fact, the Marine Department was going to prosecute him and he skipped to the United States.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it because he was a defaulter or because you recommended his dismissal that he was dismissed ?

Mr. DYMENT. I think that a defaulter to one department of the Government should not be continued in the employ of any other department.

Mr. SPROULE. But was that considered.

Mr. LISTER. Would you have taken him on again ?

Mr. DYMENT. Another man who was on last year but is not on this year has been suspended several times by the superintendent, Mr. Boyd, and another man had been suspended by Mr. Boyd a couple of times for drunkenness. I do not think that such men should be taken on. Ten of them never applied to me or to anybody to be employed. They recognized that they were employed for the season and did not expect to go on again. It seems to me, hon. gen-

tlemen opposite who are so solicitous for their friends in the matter of mail contracts ought not to find fault with us if in the case of these who were not permanent employees, we recommended those whom we preferred. I do not think the Minister of Railways and Canals has done wrong. A number were left on, because it was thought that there should be enough of the old hands to ensure the efficient running of the canal; and I am informed by the officials here that it never worked better.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What about the man referred to by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) who had only one limb out of the four ?

Mr. DYMENT. He was night-watchman, and I do not think he was a fit man for that position. He could not run and tell anybody if a fire occurred. The mere fact that he is a cripple was not a sufficient reason for keeping him in a place the duties of which he could not perform efficiently.

Mr. SPROULE. I can only say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dymont) has made a painful exhibition of the use of the authority he possesses, a painful exhibition for a young man—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. It may be a laughing matter to men who are well off in the world; but, when a man has to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow and has lost one limb out of the four, for that man to be kicked out by a man who has got plenty in the world and is operating on the timber belonging to the country and practically filling his pockets, I say is inhuman. Now, with regard to the statement that the hon. gentleman made that some of the men who were dismissed were guilty of partisanship, one of these was Mr. T. A. Brown. I have known Mr. Brown for twenty years, and I would take his word as ready as I would take that of any man in the country, and I have his emphatic denial that he took any part in the election. Would it be reasonable, I would ask the hon. gentleman himself, considering that the election took place on the 30th of June, a week after the general elections, when the Conservatives were defeated—would it be common sense for these men to take part in the election knowing that they might be dismissed? Mr. Brown tells me that he did not take any part in the election, and that he was dismissed without any charge being made against him so far as he knows.

Mr. LISTER. They were not dismissed.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon gentleman (Mr. Lister) is merely quibbling. Men had been on the canals in this country for forty years and the custom of the country had been to re-employ them, but at the open-