

that attitude. Not only on that occasion, but in the numerous manifestos which he has issued in the various elections that have taken place since 1896, he has pledged himself to Civil Service reform—that he would appoint officers not for partisan considerations, but on merit, that politics was to have nothing to do with it. These were the principles on which he received the votes of the people; and after 14 years of his preaching that kind of doctrine throughout Canada, we are now to be told that we are to be guided by the old principles that we acted on 14 or 15 years ago. It seems to me that we ought to have made some progress since that time, but I do not think we have made any. I submit that under the circumstances, Mr. Sutherland is entitled to an investigation. There is no evidence in that letter on which any man in a British country ought to be convicted, and the minister, if he wants to do what is fair and right, will give this man an investigation, and if there is no proof of any active partisanship on his part, he will put him back in the place from which he was dismissed.

**MR. MONK.** I stated that I thought there had been some progress, and I believe there has been. In 1896, men were dismissed without any complaint, almost without the intervention of the minister. There are cases recorded in 'Hansard' in which Mr. Blair will be found to have stated that dismissals had taken place before the matters had come to his knowledge. There was also in 1896 a refusal to grant any investigation. I mentioned at that time a few cases that were familiar to me. I will just refer to two as examples. Here is a question which I put, which will be found on page 2410 of 'Hansard' of 1897:

1. How long has Joseph Sauvé, lately bridgemaster No. 5 bridge, Côte St. Paul, Lachine canal, been in the employ of the government?

2. Why was he dismissed on the 30th April last?

3. Was there any complaint against him, and by whom?

4. Who was named bridgemaster in his place, and by whom was the new nominee recommended?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Joseph Sauvé, lately bridgemaster, bridge No. 5, Côte St. Paul, Lachine canal, has been employed during the season of navigation since the 1st of May, 1878. His services were dispensed with at the request and on the representations of the members of parliament for Montreal district; the department did not receive any written complaint against Sauvé. Joseph Archibierre was appointed bridgemaster in place of Joseph Sauvé.

Here is another one:

1. How long has Joseph Deschamps, lately lockmaster, No. 4 lock, Côte St. Paul, Lachine canal, been in the employ of the government?

2. Why was he dismissed on the 30th of April last?

3. Was there any complaint against him, and by whom?

4. Has he been replaced by one Adolphe Fichaud, of St. Henri, brother-in-law of the member for Hochelaga?

5. Who recommended the new lockmaster for nomination?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Joseph Deschamps, lately lockmaster at lock 4, Côte St. Paul, Lachine canal, has been employed during the season of navigation since the 1st June, 1873. His services were dispensed with at the request and on the representation of the members of parliament for Montreal district, no written complaint was lodged in the department. Adolphe Fichaud was appointed lockmaster in his place.

The book is full of such declarations. I could give my hon. friend one statement of Mr. Blair in which he took the ground that the government considered that public employees occupied their positions during pleasure, and that the government was not obliged to communicate to parliament confidential representations made to it in regard to those employees. Although this case is not as strong a one as I have seen, there is a direct, open, public denunciation by a man known in the place, and I am informed, although I do not know him, that he is not such a peaceable man as my hon. friend says, but a very strong partisan, and that would be established by an investigation. If my hon. friend wishes for an investigation, it will take place.

**MR. SINCLAIR.** I wish the minister to note that the dismissal he has cited was at the instance of the members of parliament from the Montreal district. I would say that was a very strong case. If any official is so offensive that he is indicted by a number of members of parliament, he should surely be turned out of office. I would not complain if a member of parliament stated on his honour that Mr. Sutherland had been guilty of anything.

**MR. MONK.** Would my hon. friend have found it a very good answer if I had said that this man had been dismissed on the request of the members of parliament from Nova Scotia?

**MR. SINCLAIR.** Yes, if the members from Nova Scotia, or any one of them, will father this thing and accept the responsibility for it and say they are prepared to defend it on the floor of parliament, that is all I would ask. But that is not what we have got. We have an office-seeker, a man who is looking for the job, simply making the statement that this man was an active Liberal.

**MR. BRADBURY.** I am a little surprised at the attitude of the hon. gentlemen opposite regarding dismissals, in view of their record since 1896. Why, Sir, at one time