

MR. LANGEVIN said he had called the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that one of his officers was canvassing in Rimouski.

MR. HUNTINGTON said Mr. Phileas Gillotte was merely paid a percentage, like any other postmaster. Did the hon. gentleman want to lay down the rule that a postmaster had no right to express his opinion?

MR. LANGEVIN said this was a salary. It was not like the case of a country postmaster. Why should the country be paying this man to canvass in Rimouski? It was the same thing with Commander Lavoie. If they could do this, why should not also Mr. Pitan or Mr. Doyon, or Mr. Kierskowski, translators of this House? Hon. gentlemen said they desired to separate the affairs of the Dominion from the affairs of the Local Governments, but they allowed their officers to canvass for their friends.

MR. SPEAKER said a very serious charge had been made against the management of the House of Commons. Mr. Bienvenu had, three or four weeks ago, applied to him to have his brother accepted in his stead, on the staff of the French translators, stating that he had urgent business requiring him to be away. He (Mr. Speaker) insisted upon having from Mr. Courselles indirectly, a statement that the young gentleman was competent to do the work, and he believed he was now on the staff. Mr. Pitan applied for leave of absence on the ground of illness in his family and got it on that ground only. If Mr. Kierskowski had left; he had done so without his leave or knowledge. Mr. Doyon had given up his position.

MR. LANGEVIN said Mr. Kierskowski had gone into the county of Ottawa and made speeches at the church doors.

MR. SPEAKER said he was not aware of it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said this was a very grave charge as the Speaker had said. One man, under the pretext of private business, had gone off and got his younger brother appointed. Mr. Pitan had told a false-

MR. HUNTINGTON.

hood, and had gone electioneering; he ought to be discharged.

MR. MACKENZIE: Did the hon. gentleman always dismiss every official who took part in an election. If my memory does not fail me, one of the principal officers in this Department was on a platform with the hon. gentleman denouncing his political opponents.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: What officer?

MR. MACKENZIE: Mr. Moylan.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said Mr. Moylan was at a public dinner given to him at Peterborough at a time when he was there on duty. That was the only time he remembered Mr. Moylan's being with him. But here were three officers who got leave of absence at a time when the Premier said they could not get the returns down with sufficient rapidity.

MR. MACKENZIE said they did not make out the Returns. He recollected one of the hon. gentleman's deputy adjutants-general appearing in New Brunswick in an election.

MR. MITCHELL: Who?

MR. MACKENZIE: Mr. Inches.

MR. MITCHELL said he had never heard of it. He might have been in his own country, and, if so, he should have been turned out; but he was never in the northern part of the Province.

MR. BLAKE said Mr. Moylan was connected with the Penitentiaries Service, and he was not aware that there was a penitentiary at Peterborough.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: He was travelling all over.

MR. MACKENZIE: There is no penitentiary west of Kingston.

MR. LANDERKIN said that but for the indignant appeals of the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) he would not have mentioned certain incidents which had occurred in his own riding a few years ago. Although a postmaster there, an appointee of the late Government, had actively and earnestly canvassed against him, he would have thought it beneath him to have taken steps towards his dismissal, or to