

petency on the part of the official in question that this file would seem to suggest. However, I am not discussing that point, because I am not now asking for his reinstatement. But the minister says that not the slightest suspicion has been cast upon him by the manager or officials of the Intercolonial Railway. I notice on going through the file that they have been pretty careful about what they put in writing, and naturally so, because as soon as they put anything in writing in regard to a man's character they are liable to action; they are not exempt, as my hon. friend would be in regard to anything he said in the House,—although I know he would not say anything derogatory to the gentleman. But in one of his letters Mr. Hayes, then manager of the railway, writing to the Minister of Railways, said:

I wish to assure you and Mr. Mullen that the cause of Mr. Carvill's removal from the position of city ticket agent was not entirely due to recent developments but rather to general incompetency.

Mr. J. D. REID: That is right.

Mr. COPP: "Not entirely due to recent developments". What would you infer from that expression? A burglary was committed on a certain day. Subsequently the man who had charge of the office was summarily dismissed and the police who had been working on the case were sent away. Then the manager of the Intercolonial Railway, in subsequent correspondence, points out that this man's dismissal was "not entirely due to these recent developments", but was due "rather to general incompetency".

Mr. J. D. REID: He was dismissed for his carelessness.

Mr. COPP: From a reading of that paragraph one would see at once that the General Manager was using both strings to his bow. If the man was guilty of burglary, he should be dismissed; if he was not guilty of burglary he should be dismissed anyway, on the ground of incompetency. That is the only legal interpretation you could make of that paragraph in Mr. Hayes' letter. It is written with a great deal of acumen, I grant you; he carefully guards himself on every hand. But I should like to point out that in December, 1916, the offer of higher salary was made to this man by this same manager—and up to that time not a single word had been uttered against his record or his competency. But he was offered a higher salary and a more responsible position if he would leave St. John because he was receiving the

highest salary that could be paid to an official there. It does not seem to me that his incompetency could develop to such an extraordinary degree in the three months between December, 1916, and March, 1917. If there is justice in the mind of anybody who has had charge of this matter, that man should be given an investigation; indeed, his case should have been investigated at the time. It is never too late to right a wrong that has been done to an individual in a case of this kind. My hon. friend speaks of the expense of this, but surely the expense would not be so very large. I may say to my hon. friend that if the Department of Railways and Canals are in an economical frame of mind to-night and feel that they should not impose upon the country by appointing a commissioner to sit for one day in the city of St. John, I feel sure some means could be taken by the friends of Mr. Carvill to pay for the commissioner if the Government do not feel they are able to spend this large amount of money to do justice to an official who has served them for eighteen years.

I have placed the facts before the minister, and I appeal to the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Wigmore) who knows the situation and who, no doubt, knows this man, to support my request for an investigation. I do not know this man, but I have received numerous letters from him and most heart-rending letters from Mrs. Carvill that the family has been ostracised by the people of St. John because of a gross injustice—I care not who is responsible for it—that was forced upon him through no fault of his own. He had charge of this office, and through all this voluminous correspondence he gives the best of reasons why he was absent from the office at that time. He was absent on official duty; he was taken from his office to ticket military trains through St. John. He left his office before six o'clock and he was at work at the station until ten o'clock at night, to do for this railway what he thought was his duty. Are the Minister of Railways and his officials, some of whom to-day are directors of this great railway system, prepared to accept the responsibility of allowing this man to suffer under a shadow, a cloud, a suspicion, not of his own making, but forced upon him at that time by the officials of the Intercolonial railway for whose acts the Minister of Railways and Canals must be responsible in this House to-night. I ask him if he refuses the fair and just demands of this man, who stands to-day prac-

[Mr. Copp.]