

York. And why should we have all this extravagance in each case for one man supposed to make an inspection tour. In my view those inspection tours are unnecessary. The engineers in charge do travel by hand-car and control the work. A superintendent might be allowed a special compartment in a train, but I can see no reason why he should be supplied with a private car so that he may travel like the Prime Minister or the Governor General. If savings were made in this connection the result would be that employees who now earn their livelihood by the sweat of their brows, men who are doing useful work and are in charge of large families would be allowed to remain at their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I have something very interesting to tell you. So that there may be no misunderstanding by hon. members not familiar with the French language I shall attempt to translate the documents before me from French into English. Perhaps I should not have taken this opportunity to place the correspondence before the house had I not received a communication dated September 20, from the Postmaster General in which he extended to me an invitation to take advantage of this session to expose some matters, or to ask questions. In reply I sent a page to his office stating that I wished to speak about him this afternoon. Very unfortunately he answered that he was too busy to come to this chamber. Probably he was learning the English language, although I suggest he speaks better English than French. Probably the minister was learning that his name in English would be translated by the word "exit." I feel free to say what I think about his ways and doings, although, Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to do so. However he has been notified by writing and by word of mouth; he does not want to come to the chamber, therefore it will be so much the worse for him.

In a speech delivered at Place Viger hotel in Montreal on September 9, he said this:

The only change shows that the post offices receiving remuneration lower than \$3,000 fell under the control of the Postmaster General, but the preference goes just the same to the veteran who, according to the report of the inspector, receives sixty per cent or over in his examination. This is the new article 57a in the amended law.

On April 8, 1932, there was a motion in the house asking for a copy of all reports in connection with the dismissal of the postmaster at Notre Dame du Lac, and the appointment of his successor. The return was tabled on April 11. On May 30, I received a letter from the Postmaster General's secretary stating that

the report on the candidates had not been forwarded to the Civil Service Commission. On June 8, I asked for that report; on June 11, I received from the Postmaster General a letter which meant nothing; on June 15, I asked for the report and was told it was not included in the file on account of a clerical error. On June 17, I received the following communication:

I must tell you that the administrator's report was sent only a short time after it was received for a new examination of the candidate, and we have not received it back.

On June 22, I received the following:

As a matter of fact the document has not been taken away with the intention of preventing production in the House of Commons. After having examined it the departmental officials have found that for certain reasons the file was incomplete and have sent it back to the administrator. It is a matter of departmental routine.

What happened in that instance? A veteran made application. How was he rated by Mr. Green, the Quebec superintendent? According to a letter sent to me on June 13, 1932, by the Postmaster General, the man was rated eighty-five per cent. Although I have not time to read the whole letter from Mr. Underwood to Mr. Green, I shall read at least part of it:

March 24, 1932.

Dear Sir:

I am returning herewith your report on the applicants for this position.

In reference to the application of Mr. Dominique Cote, returned soldier, the inspector rates the application eighty-five per cent but it is stated that the location and accommodation offered are poor.

A good reason! The fact is, however, that the same location was offered that had been used for years before. Here is something to which I should like to draw the attention of the house: That report was not tabled in the house because the Postmaster General objected to the fact that the man was rated eighty-five per cent by an officer of his department. That is why he sent it back to have it changed. He took the trouble to have a letter signed by that man photographed and sent to me. On that occasion I said, "Mr. Minister, you will note that this man, a veteran and applicant for the position, exhibits much better handwriting than you or I." Matters were so arranged that a man other than the veteran applicant received the position. The veteran was insulted when he was accused of ignorance because, as a matter of fact, he was as well educated as the minister.