

The Standard

Published by The Standard Limited, 22 Prince William Street, St. John, N. B., Canada.

SUBSCRIPTION.

Daily Edition, by Carrier, per year.....\$5.00
Daily Edition, by Mail, per year.....3.00
Semi-Weekly Edition, by Mail, per year.....1.00
Single Copies Two Cents.

TELEPHONE CALLS:

Business Office.....Main 1722
Editorial and News.....Main 1746

ST. JOHN, N. B., THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 1912.

THE RECORD OF DISMISSALS—1896 AND 1911.

In default of anything better to occupy their attention, the Laurier newspapers have of late been uttering prolonged howls on the subject of dismissals by the Conservatives. It may be well, therefore, if for a change we look carefully into the facts. There are two points of view to be considered. First, there is the party man's standpoint. Are the Conservatives playing the ordinary party game harshly? Are they behaving with greater severity than was shown by the Liberals in 1896? Are they behaving with the same severity as that displayed by the Liberals in that famous year? To put it otherwise, have Liberal politicians and Liberal newspapers any reason to reproach Conservatives with doing things from which they abstained? Secondly, there is the standpoint of public service. Forgetting the behavior of the Liberals, assuming even that the Conservatives should be more generous than the Liberals were in their day of triumph, that they should have higher ideals—have they been harsh?

First, about the Liberal record. When the Liberals won in 1896 they were in the position of having been in power very little; the public service was largely of Conservative appointment; the Liberals regarded it with great aversion; and there was much talk of general dismissals. In the end there was no general clearing out, and this fact rather impressed public imagination; the tradition which has grown up is that there were scarcely any. The fact is that there were about 700 dismissals—and the public service was far smaller than it is present.

Seven hundred dismissals. That is the Liberal record. The Liberal newspapers which denounced Conservatives for their dismissals today must first prove that they exceed 700, or else frankly demand that Conservatives conduct themselves on a higher plane than their own party did. Indeed, 700 today would be a far smaller proportion of the whole service than it was in 1896.

Should there be no dismissals at all? That is absurd. What about the horde of Western land agents and other officials who made it impossible for Conservatives to carry elections, who notified homesteaders that they would lose their farms if they dared to serve the country by attending camp in the ranks of the militia, who fairly tyrannized over the settlers? What about fishery overseers in the Maritime Provinces who were Liberal workers salaried by the state? What about offensive partisans everywhere?

The Laurier rule, as everyone knows, was that offensive partisans must go. Ordinarily an investigation was held; but if a Liberal member of Parliament or defeated candidate wrote a letter charging a man with partisanship that was deemed investigation enough.

Now let us survey the Conservative record. First, there have been no dismissals in the inside service. Next, as to the outside service. In the House of Commons, in the Sergeant-at-Arms Department, 22 persons have been dismissed and 10 have left of their own accord; among the latter are pages who have grown too old to go on the floor. In 1896 there were 36 dismissals.

In the Railways and Canals Department the Liberals in 1896 made a great sweep on the Intercolonial. The dismissals began with the Chief Engineer of the road and went down to a track-walker. The Standard recently published almost a page of names of men who had been dismissed.

In 1911 Mr. Cochrane is taking the following line:—First, there must be an investigation in every case. Every man on the Intercolonial whose conduct is under suspicion is entitled to an investigation. Three commissioners have been appointed to investigate charges—Mr. Emile Giff of Quebec, in Quebec, Mr. James A. McDonald of Halifax, in Nova Scotia, and Mr. E. T. C. Knowles of St. John in this province. Secondly, if any vacancy is created, it will, if suitable men are available, be filled by promotions. There are three or four rather high officials under suspension on various charges, and if they are dismissed the Minister will look for their successors among men already in the service. A consideration which has arisen is that of men whom the Liberals appointed to replace men whom they dismissed for partisan reasons. While the case is difficult, Mr. Cochrane is disposed not to retaliate. On the canals so far there has been only one dismissal, while several have resigned. Mr. Cochrane's conduct is not only better than that of the Liberals in 1896, but is absolutely fair, independent of comparisons.

The great hubbub has been raised over public works. This is an enormous department, with numerous jobs continually beginning and ending. In 1896, when the expenditure was only \$1,300,000, as against over twenty millions which the department has handled in some recent years, over 50 employees were dismissed. This year a number of persons have been dismissed outside of Ottawa, and a number of foremen, clerks of work, etc., have found their temporary work come to an end. In Ottawa itself 144 men have been dismissed, and it is over these men that the principal outcry has been made. Their numbers were magnified to 200 or more and in particular it was related that Mr. John Rioux, the elderly and polite elevator man near Mr. Borden's office, had been dismissed for saying "au revoir" to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, when the former Prime Minister quitted office; and had been restored by Mr. Borden's personal intervention.

The facts are that only 23 out of the 144 were permanent employees. The remaining 111 were casuals. It is the custom to take a number of temporary men on early in the autumn and let them go in October or November. The Liberal Government took these men on in the late summer; had the Laurier Government won they would have been let go when the season ended. The present Government gave the men an extra month, until the middle of December, and then let them go. Thus the men got a Christmas present of an extra month and the Government is blamed for dismissing them at Christmas.

About Mr. John Rioux, he was not dismissed and there was no intention of dismissing him. A man named Proulx was on the dismissal list; the person to whom was deputed the task of notifying those who were to go was in a hurry—could not find Proulx—concluded that it must mean Rioux—served him with the fatal paper and went his way. In the morning the mistake was discovered, but meanwhile poor John had had a great fright and the Liberal press a good story. Finally, Mr. Monk had laid down the rule that if any discharged employee appeals to him he will grant an investigation, and has appointed a barrister, Mr. Chauvin, to investigate the Ottawa cases.

In Trade and Commerce there have been no dismissals for political reasons. Mr. Preston resigned as soon

as the result of the elections reached him; three trade commissioners have been dismissed, but in no case for any but strictly departmental reasons. Some annuity lecturers have been allowed to go, as a result of a change in policy; no successors have been appointed.

The Department of Agriculture has nearly 1,000 persons on its rolls, of whom over 600 are in the outside service. One person has been dismissed for political and four or five for departmental reasons. In 1896 there were between 30 and 40 dismissals. The staff then was much smaller.

There are about 1,100 persons on the payroll of the Department of Indian Affairs. About a dozen have been dismissed. The number in 1896 was between twenty-five and thirty.

The roll-call of postmasters has increased greatly since 1896—from about 9,000 to well over 13,000. The dismissals have fallen far below those of 1896. There have been a number of dismissals for departmental as opposed to political reasons—for insubordination, carelessness, neglect, etc. For political partisanship there have been from 100 to 125 cases of dismissals. In addition, Mr. Pelletier has reinstated about 50 postmasters who were wrongfully dismissed in 1896. In each case of this sort there has been an investigation to satisfy the Postmaster General that the original dismissal was unjust.

In the matter of dismissals for partisanship Mr. Pelletier has held himself directly within the rules of the Lake resolution of the House of Commons in 1905—that a public servant is entitled to the free exercise of his franchise but is expected to abstain from active political work. He also has followed the procedure laid down by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1896; if a member of Parliament makes a charge in writing, that is accepted as sufficient proof; otherwise, an investigation takes place.

The Interior is a department which was notorious for the undisguised and effective partisanship of the outside service; in this category must be placed the Immigration Service, which is a branch of the Interior Department. In their pre-election utterances the Conservatives distinctly promised that no mercy need be expected by homestead inspectors and others who used their official powers to bully immigrants into voting Liberal. In this department a very clean sweep was made in 1896. This time the higher ranks of the outside service have been little affected; of officers of sufficient rank to derive their appointment from an order in council, only two are going. Among the lower ranks, whose appointments are departmental, a good many have been displaced, it being difficult to state the number; the widespread partisanship of many divisions of the outside service making candidates for justifiable removal numerous. It must be noted that there are certain employees, such as land guides, who are employed by the day only, when there is work to do, not for any stated period. It would be easy to juggle statistics either by including those in this category who are not again engaged in the list of "dismissals" or by omitting them from all account.

In the Marine and Fisheries Department the record is that after the Liberal victory of 1896 about 250 dismissals took place. These were divided pretty evenly between the Marine and the Fisheries branches. Some of these were undoubtedly on grounds of economy and efficiency; so far as economy goes, the outside staff in 1896, including crews of vessels, numbered 2,400 and in 1901 had risen to 2,746. At present the outside staff of the Fisheries branch is 1,300 and that of the Marine branch is between 2,500 and 3,000. Thus over 10 per cent. of the outside service was displaced by the Liberals as a result of their victory.

This year the number of dismissals in the two branches of the department is less than ninety. In the Fisheries branch 28 officials have been released, or rather over 2 per cent.; in addition about 40 fishery overseers were let go and not replaced, the Minister regarding their appointment as a duplication of work already under the jurisdiction of and done by the Provincial Governments. Of the 28 dismissals seven are for non-political reasons. In some cases works are being discontinued; in another case there are charges of fraud, and so on.

In the Marine branch there have been 57 dismissals; of these one is for farming out work, another is because the agent reported the man to be unfit for his work; in yet another the man had been arrested, in another the reason was drunkenness. In about 40 cases partisanship is explicitly stated in the order of dismissal as the cause. The dismissals for partisanship in the whole department amount to something like 70. The percentage of dismissals is two or three.

Thus the Conservatives, succeeding to a staff nearly twice as large as in 1896, have dismissed between one-half and one-third as many persons. It remains to be added that in cases of partisanship the Laurier rule is followed; the written statement of a member of Parliament is accepted. Where that is lacking the Minister takes steps to ascertain the truth of the charges.

In the Customs Department the only dismissal of a prominent man has been at Oshawa, where the collector was removed on the written statement of the local member that he had displayed partisanship. A number of elderly employees in the outside service have been superannuated and their places have been filled. In addition there are a considerable number of what might be termed semi-casual employees—landing waiters, etc., whose employment ends with the close of navigation. These people have no guarantee of re-employment in the ensuing season; their work being occasional, and a good many of them will not be re-engaged when the coming season opens. The Liberal axe swung very freely in this department in 1896; in addition to actual dismissals there were numerous occasions where a man's output would be abolished—a new one being set up a mile or two away; or where a man's salary would be omitted from the appropriations. Mr. Reid has been careful to investigate all cases brought before him.

It is hardly necessary to go into the record of the smaller departments. The same tale would be told. The Labor Department affords a characteristic example. The Labor Gazette has between 40 and 50 "local correspondents" who make a monthly report on the labor market in their vicinity, receiving \$100 a year each. The report went out that a clean sweep had been made of them. The fact is that eight were released for departmental reasons.

Summing up from this detailed survey the following facts are revealed:

1. No dismissals have occurred in the inside service.
2. The number of persons employed in the outside service has increased greatly since 1896.
3. About 700 dismissals of outside service people occurred in 1896.
4. Far fewer dismissals in the outside service have occurred in 1911, despite the great increase in the numbers of the staff.
5. On the whole the Conservative Ministers are following the rule laid down by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1896. In some cases they are imposing on themselves additional restrictions as to evidence, investigation and the replacement of persons dismissed.
6. There has been no lack of offensive partisans who do not deserve to continue in office. Certain constituencies in the Maritime Provinces, for instance, saw the polls manned in the Liberal interest by light-house keepers and other public servants. In the West the activity of the Interior officials has been notorious for years.

On the whole the Conservative record exhibits a distinct advance in humanity and in fairness on the temper displayed by the victorious Liberals of fifteen years ago.

(Edmonton Journal.)

Are you superstitious? If so, add the digits that form the present year, and look cheerful.

CLARK CASE UP IN CIRCUIT COURT ALL DAY YESTERDAY

Interesting Evidence Given—Defence Case Closed when Court Adjourned Last Evening—Counsel will Address Jury Today—Prisoner on Stand Yesterday Said Bank was Amply Secured.

The case of the King vs. Harry B. Clark, formerly manager of the market branch of the Bank of New Brunswick, was commenced before Mr. Justice Barry and the following jury in the Circuit Court yesterday morning at ten o'clock: Messrs. E. Roy Fenwick, Charles G. Hoyt, Fred R. Patterson, James C. Doherty, Edward Evans, W. Norman Earle, Neil J. Seely, Geo. W. Mullin, R. Dominick Hayes, J. W. Calhoun, A. Wallace Emery and Thomas Dillon.

Little difficulty was experienced in getting a jury. The crown challenged one and set one aside. The defence challenged one for cause and three peremptorily.

Attorney General Grimmer appeared for the crown and Geo. W. Fowler, K.C., M.P., for the accused.

The court arose yesterday afternoon shortly before five o'clock, just after the defence had concluded their case. Counsel will address the jury this morning and a verdict will be reached either at noon or early in the afternoon.

The accused is charged with stealing the sum of \$2,477.21, the property of the Bank of New Brunswick.

Henry Gallagher, a member of the grocery and liquor firm of M. H. Gallagher and Co., had this sum on deposit in his own name in the market branch. On March 27 last Mr. Gallagher had the account transferred to himself and his sister. He gave Clark a check and cashed it at the bank. The amount to the credit of the joint account placed it to the credit of one McBeath, to reduce the amount of the latter's overdraft. This is the explanation which he gave on the stand yesterday afternoon and the defence

will endeavor to prove that this act does not constitute a theft in law.

Mr. Gallagher, R. B. Kessen, general manager of the bank, and C. F. Sanford, of Barnhill, Ewing and Sanford, testified yesterday's sitting.

Clark took the stand in his own defence and admitted that he was in the hole a little on account of engaging in speculations. He denied that he owed the bank any money but had borrowed some on putting up collateral security. H. H. Smith of J. C. Mackintosh and Co., testified for the defence. Considerable amusement was caused when Mr. Smith and the Attorney General clashed on the matter of answering a question.

The feature of the case is the absence of cross firing between counsel.

The Morning Session.

At the morning session Attorney General Grimmer outlined the case of the prosecution. He spoke of a letter written and signed by the defendant himself in which he stated to the general manager of the bank that he had taken the amount of \$2,477.21, and was about to speak of further confession of guilt. Mr. George W. Fowler, K.C., for the defence, objected to making any statements to the jury which did not pertain to the point in issue. After some discussion and argument, the Attorney General proceeded, in the present, without mentioning the rest of the contents of Clark's letter to Mr. Kessen.

Henry Gallagher was the first witness and told of his dealings with Clark when he was manager of the Charlotte street branch of the Bank of New Brunswick. Mr. Gallagher said he had lost no money.

R. B. Kessen, general manager of the Bank of New Brunswick, was the next witness. A letter signed by Clark, addressed to Mr. Kessen, was offered in evidence, and witness identified the signature, and stated he received it by mail between the 10th and 20th of June. Before the letter was read, Mr. Fowler objected to any portion of it being read, except the body of the letter, which did not refer to the specific charge. It was agreed. The attorney then read the letter. The letter was dated at "Hotel La Salle, Chicago, 1911," and began "My Dear Mr. Kessen." In opening Clark made a general confession of guilt and certain misappropriations of money and expressed his regret at having got mixed up with customers and at having to do what he had to do to get out of the hole. That the load might be more easily borne by the bank, he said he was enclosing a list of certain items, among which was an amount of \$2,477.21, which he confessed he misappropriated from the bank's account. He hoped to God that the matter might be arranged so as the bank would suffer no loss. He wrote to Mr. Kessen that he had not told his wife anything of his misappropriations, and asked for her sake, that the matter be hushed up as much as possible. He hoped that he would some day be able to liquidate the whole amount, and closed by thanking Mr. Kessen for kindness and consideration in the money matters, also for the consideration of his wife.

The ledger page containing the Gallagher account was then offered in evidence. Witness stated that he immediately after receiving Clark's letter, he ordered that Mr. Gallagher's account be credited with \$2,477.21. Cross-examined by Mr. Fowler, witness stated that all the branches of the bank were inspected and audited annually. In 1910 and 1909, the Market branch was inspected by Mr. Roy, and nothing irregular was noted in the accounts. The inspection for 1911 was on the 21st of June, and at that time everything was as far as witness knew, was straight. No one had ever called his attention to any irregularities. The inspection was all right, but witness can only deal with what he finds. The bookkeeper can always beat the auditor. The inspection was made because it has a moral influence, but the bank, like every other institution, was powerless to detect fraud. Witness stated that the wrong-doing about the 7th June. An item came through for collection from outside, through the St. John office. Witness saw it was suspicious and made an enquiry of Mr. Clark. As a result of the enquiry witness placed Mr. Roy in charge, allowed Clark to go to New York, paid the expenses, and had the bank's solicitor, C. F. Sanford, accompany him. Clark went there to see one of the bank's customers.

Interesting Evidence. Mr. Fowler—Had the trip to New York any connection with this matter? Witness—I can't see any connection. Mr. Fowler—Why was it necessary to send Mr. Clark? Witness—Because Mr. Clark said he could, by seeing one of the bank's customers, prevent a loss to the bank. Mr. Fowler—Didn't it concern more than one customer, and wasn't there a deal which was to be put through which would clear the whole matter? Witness—Yes, there was something of that kind.

Mr. Fowler—Do you know that this amount of \$2,477.21 was credited to the account of one of these very customers? Witness—No. Mr. Fowler—Then it might have a connection with this matter? Witness—That's strictly true. Mr. Fowler—Do you think so? Are you prepared to swear that this amount was not taken from one account and credited to another, but still remained with the bank? Witness—No. Mr. Fowler—Who was this customer? Was it McBeath? Witness—No. Mr. Fowler—Was it Collins? Witness—Yes. Mr. Fowler—Mr. Collins was connected with Mr. Clark, was he not? Witness—I believe so. Mr. Fowler—Will you say that if it had not been for Mr. McBeath, there would have been none of this trouble at the bank? Witness—I can't say. Mr. Fowler—Now, what was this proposition? Witness—Collins owed the bank some money, and had discounted papers and said if he could get more

WATCHES

The most critical judge of beauty of design as applied to the handicraft of watch production, will of a surety be more than satisfied with The Artistic Merchandise that we are showing in this branch of the Jeweller's art. For this season's trade.

GOLD WATCHES, GOLD FILLED WATCHES, also watches cased in Silver, Gun Metal and Nickel. LADIES' AND MISSES' BRACELET-WATCHES of various styles and prices.

The prices throughout the whole wide range of our watch stock are Quality for Quality, the lowest obtainable.

FERGUSON & PAGE, Diamond Importers and Jewellers, 41 KING STREET.



Perfection Ankle Support

This simple device is made of best quality steel and is designed to give weak ankles perfect support while skating.

A hinge and sliding attachment allows the ankles to bend forward and backward freely, but absolutely prevents them from going sideways.

Made for men, women and children. It has been widely adapted by hockey players.

Per Pair \$1.00

T. McAVITY & SONS, Ltd., 13 King St.

Stationery Supplies

A Full Line of Account Books

Figuring Books, 2 to 16 columns

All sizes of Loose Leaf Binders and Holders in stock and made to order.

BARNES & CO. Ltd., 84 Prince William St.

The Empire Typewriter

More than makes good because it costs less in the first place, is cheapest in the long run; does more and better work.

WRITE OR CALL FOR DETAILS AND TERMS.

FRANK R. FAIRWEATHER, Agent

52 Canterbury Street, St. John, N.B. Phone Main 653.

money he could clear an equity on certain bonds, and pay the whole amount. Before the 6th of June witness said he only knew that Clark had exceeded his authority by irregularly giving too much money to customers, but was not prepared to say that they were such as would make Clark amenable to the law. Mr. Sanford accompanied Mr. Clark to New York only to advise him regarding legal matters. Witness said he sent Clark to New York to listen to a proposition, that Collins was going to make, and was to apply to all that Collins told about. If the deal had been made, it would have been sufficient to cover all loss by irregularities as far as witness knew.

Mr. Fowler—Wasn't there some specific bond to be investigated?

Witness—Yes, the bonds of the New York Steel Company.

Mr. Fowler—You could have had them?

Witness—Yes, by paying for them.

Mr. Fowler—What value would bonds for \$1,000,000 with guaranteed interest at 4 per cent. for 20 years be when purchased at a lion of \$50,000, assuming the bonds were legal, and the guarantor was all right?

Witness—Certainly they would have value, but I would not express an opinion as to the value.

Witness stated that a few days after the 7th of June, he learned something else from Mr. Roy, but the first real information he had was when he received the letter. Mr. Sanford had returned home before the letter was received. Witness received no more letters from Clark, but may have had a telegram. A letter he wrote to Clark was returned through the dead letter office. He may have received two telegrams, but did not answer any. When he wrote to Clark he was only asking information. Witness knew of McBeath and Collins being customers of the bank, before June 6th. He did not know Mr. Helon to be a customer. Collins and McBeath were the only two of this kind. Collins' account was not very large.

Mr. Fowler—How large?

Witness—That would be disclosing a customer's business. I don't think it's a proper question.

Now Locked Up.

Mr. Fowler—Well, how about Mr. McBeath? Have you any delicacy about him, knowing he was in the "pen" in Ontario?

His Honor—What's that, is he locked up?

Mr. Fowler—Yes, your Honor, for breaking some of the laws in Ontario.

His Honor—I didn't quite understand the term "pen."

Witness, proceeding, stated that McBeath did not belong here, that he was a new customer, that he had no real estate assets in New Brunswick, and that he made no examination into his financial status, except the statements received from Clark and what the books showed.

Mr. Fowler—Did you take no other steps to determine his security?

Witness—The bank wasn't dependent on that; we had security.

Mr. Fowler—Did you inquire whether these were of any more value than the paper they were written on?

Witness—They furnished the report required.

Mr. Fowler—Did you receive all the information that Mr. Clark had, and were you satisfied as he was, that everything was all right?

Witness—The account was misrepresented to me.

Mr. Fowler—Did Clark misrepresent it to you?

Witness—He misrepresented other things.

Mr. Fowler—Did he misrepresent this matter to you?

Witness—No.

Mr. Fowler—Then you were satisfied with this account.

Witness—It didn't amount to much.

Mr. Fowler—What, didn't you say it involved tens of thousands of dollars?

Witness—Yes, but we don't count it unless it is money borrowed.

Mr. Fowler—Did your bank invest any money in these bonds?

The attorney general objected, and his honor stated that he was perfectly willing to allow the question though he did not follow Mr. Fowler's reason for asking it.

Mr. Fowler—I ask it because it is my defence that the amount of \$2,477.21 was never taken out of the bank, but transferred from one account to another. I do not want to ask questions which are not necessary for my case, but if my case required, I would take the ground that this gentleman would have to disclose any of the bank's business. Now, witness, how about Mr. Collins' account?

Witness—It was larger. He appeared as a borrower. The largest amount he had borrowed was \$17,000, but it was protected by collateral security. "I found out," said witness, "ten days after Clark left that some of these bonds had been taken as broker's collateral at the head office." Witness stated the bank had loaned \$20,000 to J. C. Mackintosh and Company, receiving their note and these bonds as security. When a reliable broker in good standing offered security it was not the custom to scrutinize it carefully, and the manager might not even see it.

Continued on page five.

COULDN'T GET STRONG

Seemed to Have Lost All Ambition, was Pale and Anemic.

"I was never actually sick," writes Mrs. La Pierre, wife of a well-known resident of Labelene, "yet I never could get strong like other women. I ate & I enough, but somehow blood rich and red I never could make. When I married I took a great ride in my housekeeping, but I kept me tired all the time. Mrs. Lechance my neighbor, looked well—she told me her health had been made by Dr. Hamilton's Pills. I only thought of pills as a physic, but now I know that Dr. Hamilton's Pills are more, for they quickened my stomach, liver and bowels—made me stout and stronger, gave me such color in my cheeks as I never had before. They do good to parts in ways I need not mention in this letter, but I sincerely believe Dr. Hamilton's Pills should be used at regular intervals by every woman—that's why I write this letter."

No medicine invigorates a woman like Dr. Hamilton's Pills. 25c. per box, all dealers or the Catawba House Co., Kingston, Canada.

Illustration of a woman sitting at a table, looking unwell.