

tion I have received from the return he has handed me. No doubt he intended that I should make use of the documents, as they are public property. I find that the charge against this man is as follows:

Canso, Nov. 6, 1911.

To the Hon. L. P. Pelletier, M.P.,  
Postmaster General.

I hereby make application for the position of janitor of the post office at Canso, N.S., now held by Roderick Sutherland. Mr. Sutherland has been an active Liberal partisan, and was a worker for the Liberal candidate at the recent as well as previous elections. I beg respectfully to ask for his dismissal.

Yours truly,  
GEORGE A. PYCHE.

Charles Lohnes, President,  
Liberal-Conservative Association.  
J. J. McKENZIE, Secy.

Hon. L. P. Pelletier, M.P.,  
Postmaster General, Ottawa.

Sir,—I beg to recommend the above name, George A. Pyche, as a fit and capable man for the position of janitor of post office at Canso, N.S.

G. A. R. ROWLINGS,  
Liberal-Conservative Candidate for Guys-  
borough county.

I wish also to read a letter dated Nov. 8, 1911, from Sydney, N. S., written by Mr. Rowlings:

To the Hon. L. P. Pelletier, M.P.,  
Postmaster General,  
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—The inclosed statement of Mr. Pyche as to Mr. Roderick Sutherland, who holds the position of janitor in the post office at Canso, N.S. You will note that this statement is supported by the officers of the Conservative Association at Canso. I beg to say that Mr. Pyche is a reliable person and that his statement as to Sutherland may be relied upon in the premises.

Yours very truly,  
G. A. R. ROWLINGS,  
Liberal-Conservative candidate,  
Guysborough Co.,  
September, 1911, election.

I wish to point out to the hon. minister, in the first place, that the man who made the complaint against Mr. Sutherland is the one who is applying for his job. Mr. Lohnes does not make any complaint, or Mr. Rowlings, although they penned their names to the complaint made by Mr. Pyche. The very first thing which Mr. Pyche writes is that he is applying to be appointed to the position of janitor at the post office in Canso. He does this before he says anything about Sutherland's conduct. Evidently he found it necessary in some ways to get rid of Sutherland before he got in himself, and so he accuses him of being a political partisan. I submit that this is a very weak case. I understood the hon. minister to say that he required a certificate of some kind, either from the

Mr. SINCLAIR.

defeated or the elected candidate, but in this case we have not any such evidence. We have not even got Mr. Rowlings' certificate, who was the defeated candidate. He speaks of Pyche as a reliable man, but does not venture to say that Sutherland was guilty of anything at all himself. I submit that that is altogether too weak a case for a minister to act on without investigation. On a statement given by the applicant for the place, he gave this caretaker and his family five days to get out from their residence in the post office, at the beginning of winter. He turned this man and his family out on the street without even asking for any evidence from Mr. Pyche as to what he was guilty of. Mr. Sutherland was given no investigation at all. He should have been told at least what he was charged with. It is very easy to make a general statement that this man was an active partisan, but surely the minister ought to insist on having something more. I question whether Pyche or any one else could point to any offence which Sutherland has committed. I know Mr. Sutherland very well. I know that he is an inoffensive, quiet man. I have no doubt that he voted for me, but I would be surprised if Pyche or any one else could prove an offence against him of any kind. The minister said that we have made some progress since 1896. I do not think we have. The best argument my hon. friend has is this: You were rotten in 1896 and we are going to be rotten now. That is the only argument he has given us ever since we started to discuss this question. I drew the attention of my hon. friend before to the fact that we expected something better after 14 years of promises by my right hon. friend the leader of the government. The very first appearance of the right hon. gentleman in public life in this country, his first speech in this House, had to do with this question of Civil Service reform, and he made a very broad and generous speech. No doubt the attitude of the First Minister at that date has had a good deal to do with the fact that officials thought they were at liberty to be a little freer than they were before, because the right hon. gentleman said on that occasion—I have already quoted his deliverance in this House—that he would not only permit an officer of the government to vote against the government that employed him, but would permit him to speak on the platform at public meetings, provided he did so in a gentlemanly way and was not offensive.

I have no doubt that many men serving the government throughout the country, knowing that that was the attitude taken by the right hon. leader of the government, felt that they were at liberty not only to vote but to do more. It strikes me that he has misled a good many men by taking