

Postmaster General—and I had the record then in my hand—that W. C. Kilpatrick, the postmaster at Copper Cliff, had been found guilty and reported for corrupt practices in the election court in the famous 'Minnie M.' case at the Soo. I invited my hon. friend the Postmaster General, to look into this matter and to divest himself of the valued services of this gentleman. Did he do so? A year went by and I drew it to my hon. friend's attention again and he simply said that he would give it further consideration. Until the time that the hon. gentleman's party went out of power Mr. W. C. Kilpatrick was postmaster at Copper Cliff.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Was there any deficiency in the office? Was the office well administered?

Mr. BOYCE. He was away for two years.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He had a deputy.

Mr. BOYCE. I have told my hon. friend—it is on record in the Post Office Department to-day and it is written on the pages of 'Hansard'—that he received a petition signed by about 500 residents complaining of the shameful and disgraceful service of the office and of the absence of the postmaster for two years, and drawing the fact to his attention that this man had been reported by the judges of the court of law for corrupt practices in an election. Yet, notwithstanding all this, he did nothing.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There was never any charge of mal-administration.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, not against Mr. Kilpatrick. I remember the case perfectly well. I never made a dismissal while I was Postmaster General—never one dismissal.

Mr. PELLETIER. What?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) knows very well a friend of his, a man occupying a very high position in Quebec who had been for months and even years without going to his office. I was asked to dismiss him. The office was well managed.

Mr. PELLETIER. Who was that?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Paquet, of Quebec. I never dismissed him.

Mr. PELLETIER. Does the hon. member say that he has not dismissed postmasters?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I dismissed one on the recommendation of Mr. Sifton on the principle of accepting a member's word. Mr.

Mr. BOYCE.

Sifton promised to defend my action if it were questioned in the House, and when Mr. Lake brought the matter up in the House, I looked in vain for Mr. Sifton, and I saw him in number 16. I reminded him that he had given his word of honour that he would defend the case, and Mr. Sifton refused to come into the House.

Mr. CROTHERS. Did you reinstate him?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. CROTHERS. Why not?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Because Mr. Sifton maintained what he had written in his letter, that the man was guilty of partisanship. Other than that I never dismissed a postmaster for political partisanship.

Mr. MONK. Sir William Mulock had put them all out before you got there.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Minister of Public Works comes with his classical three cases in the county of Jacques Cartier in 1896. He stated time and again that we had dismissed the employees by hundreds in that county in 1896. Well, he has dismissed hundred of poor labourers in his department since the 21st September. In fact he has become quite bloodthirsty in his methods. Like Marat, who during the terror in France ruled Paris for a few months, he wants thousands of heads to purify the country. The Minister of Public Works has dismissed day labourers by the hundred.

Mr. MONK. The hon. member knows that is not the case.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He has dismissed hundreds of day labourers since the 21st of September, and finally when he saw that public opinion and the English press of Canada, the Toronto 'Telegram,' the Toronto 'Star,' the Montreal 'Gazette,' put him to shame, he has instituted a legal investigation and he has appointed a relative of his, Mr. Chauvin, to preside over the investigation.

Mr. MONK. The hon. member is absolutely mistaken. There are no dismissals in my department. I have appointed no relative of mine to the position of investigator, and the hon. member knows it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is not Mr. Chauvin your relative?

Mr. MONK. No.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Does the minister say that Mr. Chauvin is not his relative?

Mr. MONK. Certainly he is not.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Well, the minister deserves to be one of the famous French terrorists, he can deny anything, even his own blood.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.