

masters, here is a letter of the secretary, Mr. Foran:

Ottawa, Nov. 6th, 1918.

Sir,—I am to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 14th October in reference to the Postmastership of Chicoutimi Ouest, Que., and I am directed to say that the following procedure is adopted in the appointment of postmasters. If the salary of the post office is in excess of \$1,000 the position is locally advertised and the application referred to the post office inspector of the district for his rating. The Civil Service Commission then takes final action on same. Should, however, the position be of a salary less than \$1,000 the matter is referred to the Post Office Inspector for his recommendation as to the most suitable party to appoint.

The Post Office Inspector has, as yet, made no recommendation in this connection.

Your truly,

W. Foran,  
Secretary.

Therefore if I understand rightly, the appointments of the postmasters are not always made by the Civil Service Commission, but are referred to the Post Office Inspector, as in the case of St. Gedeon. I think it is a bad system of patronage and I hope that in the future that method will be modified.

Mr. FRANK BAINARD STACEY (Westminster District): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion so ably introduced by the two gentlemen who have deservedly received the congratulations of this House. And first of all, Sir, on my own behalf, and also on behalf of the constituency which I represent, I wish to pay our humble tribute to the memory of the great Canadian whose chair in this House is empty, but whose influence and example will not soon pass away. As I speak, Sir, I am thinking of a little town on the north shore of the mighty Fraser river, nearly three thousand miles from this Chamber, composed very largely of men and women who are proud to call themselves compatriots of the late great French-Canadian statesman. His portrait is in their public halls, and in their private homes. Though remote from the place of their birth they fondly cherish the memory of his lofty idealism, his matchless diction, his peerless presence and his personal charm. Very many of them were his political supporters, all were his personal admirers. I would be unworthy of my position as a representative of the French-Canadian settlement in my own constituency, as well as of other English-speaking Liberals, if I did not at least attempt to voice their sentiments upon this occasion, and to express them in the presence of their brothers and friends.

[Mr. Savard.]

I wish also to congratulate the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) upon a matter for which he has received divergent kinds of criticism from members of this House: I have in mind his reference to Liberal Unionists on the occasion of his first speech during this session. In that address he gave what I am willing to admit, and believe, was intended, as a courteous intimation to former Liberals now on this side of the House, that there is an open door should they desire to return to their former political friends. I am disposed to treat such an intimation in the same manner in which I assume it was given, and as a private member on this side of the House will take advantage of the opportunity thus afforded of expressing my views on the general question of parties, and the relation of individuals and individual members thereto.

I cannot, under present conditions, endorse the view sometimes set forth that we can or could get along without parties. Citizens holding somewhat similar views on any question may constitute a party and together work for the accomplishment of a definite result. The party is the means of accomplishing this end. Many people, Sir, in this country believe that in Canadian politics the party has hitherto been given an exaggerated and exalted importance, superior even to that of the end aimed at. Political parties rest, originally at least, on some great principle or policy, and when honest men differ as to the application or interpretation of those principles, there is likely to be a division in the party. For example, my interpretation of the principles of Liberalism as applied to Canadian patriotism led me to advocate publicly in my own town selective conscription two years before it became a vital issue in this House, and my neighbour, a staunch Conservative, so interpreted the principles and policy of his political faith that he reached the same conclusion. So we came together on what appeared to us to be a question of supreme and paramount importance. Here, to my mind, is the true philosophy of the election of 1917. A great majority of the people of Canada believed that the end was greater than the means; that the salvation of the country was of more importance than the perpetuation of any individual party. Sir, men may exhaust the adjectives in the English and French languages to condemn the provisions of the War-time Elections Act. It may have been good or it may have been evil; that I am not discussing, but I do believe that such denunciations amount to nothing. It is simply a case of shouting