

Mr. CROTHERS. I submit that is not a parliamentary expression and that the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) should retract.

Mr. MONK. I am very much obliged to my hon. friend (Mr. Crothers), but I can assure him I can take charge of that myself.

Mr. BOYCE. Here we have the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), admitting that he took the word of Mr. Sifton, then a member of the Liberal party with him, to dismiss a postmaster on the ground of political partisanship, but when I, a member of the opposition on my responsibility as a member, told him that the postmaster at Copper Cliff who was a Liberal had been found guilty of political partisanship by the highest court, he sat there and refused to take action. The hon. member (Mr. Lemieux), is guilty of cant and hypocrisy of the worst description when on the mere statement of a member of his own party he dismissed a Tory postmaster, and at the same time refused to dismiss a Liberal postmaster in the face of a petition signed by 500 residents of the community, complaining of the miserable incompetency of the postmaster, of his absence for two years, and of the shameful condition in which that office was run. I told him that the highest election court in Ontario had found that postmaster guilty of corrupt practices, and the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux), would not take that as sufficient evidence of political partisanship. Does the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux), remember the case of Richard Wagner who was found guilty by the court of theft from poor immigrants coming to this country, whom he was appointed by the government to care for, and who having served his term in jail, was promoted to a high place by the Liberal government; does the hon. member recollect that he sat in this House and supported the promotion of this man in the service. All these things are written in the pages of 'Hansard,' and it is idle for the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux), to indulge in pyrotechnic displays and pretend at righteous indignation when the records are so black against him. Does he recollect the case of the postmaster at Thessalon, and does he remember that he declined to take action in that case?

Mr. LEMIEUX. What was that case?

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. member has a poor memory for that case, but he can remember the poor Tory postmaster whom he dismissed on the recommendation of Mr. Sifton. I will tell him what the Thessalon case is. On the report of the post office inspector, the postmaster at Thessalon was found guilty of embezzlement, and the Postmaster General ordered his dismissal, but the postmaster at Thessalon was not dismissed. Let him look at the file in that case.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I want the file.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. member can have the file, and he can see all the facts about the case in the pages of 'Hansard' for 1905, 1906, 1907, and 1908.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What are the facts?

Mr. BOYCE. I have only got to the fact that the man had been found guilty of embezzlement and an order was given for his dismissal, and he was not dismissed and is there now.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He was dismissed and his daughter was appointed.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. gentleman is wrong. I accepted his correction a few moments ago and he must accept mine now.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am aware of the facts.

Mr. BOYCE. His daughter was not appointed but he was reappointed. His dismissal was not effected and he is there now, as postmaster of Thessalon, and I asked my hon. friend to take the matter up and he did not.

Mr. PELLETIER. Better write to me about it?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Look at the file.

Mr. BOYCE. You can see the file and you can see the whole thing at a glance, and the House can judge what a miserable and pitiable position was taken by the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) in his attempt to defend that man. My hon. friend had the matter brought to his attention when he was Postmaster General but he did nothing. Why? Because the postmaster was shown to have been, at the time the fiat was issued to dismiss him, politically active in a partisan manner, very active in the provincial and Dominion elections, and therefore was kept in his place in spite of his embezzlement and misconduct, and in spite of the report of the inspector and the fiat of the Postmaster General.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would ask my hon. friend to put the case in the hands of the present Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier). Let him take the file, and I will accept his verdict. My hon. friend knows that I would never have kept a thief as an officer in the postal service.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I may remind hon. members that this debate is completely out of order.

Mr. BOYCE. By whom was it started. I am merely answering my hon. friend. In this connection, I want to tell him that he does not have to accept the verdict of the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) but by the rules of this House he should accept my statement.