

attention to the fact that Mr. McManus was living at the time of the investigation and that he was represented by counsel. Let me for a moment—for I do not wish to occupy the time of the House at any length on a matter so insignificant, nor would I have spoken at all except for the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite are endeavouring to make political capital out of something that does not exist—let me draw the attention of the House to these charges and to the finding: and if they do not warrant the dismissal, then I am unable to form a proper judgment. Some of the charges were these:

The evidence of Thomas Webley shows some disagreement between the postmaster and Mrs. Webley as to the origin of certain correspondence addressed to the latter, concerning which the postmaster refused to give any information.

There was one charge.

The evidence of Mr. Badcock concerns chiefly his failure to receive certain letters addressed to him at Northfield, which had been reforwarded to East Wellington, where Mr. Badcock resides, although carrying on business at the former place.

There was another specific charge.

The evidence of Mrs. Margaret Patterson deals chiefly with an instance of the delivery to her daughter Lizzie of a letter concerning which the postmaster had some doubt as to whether it was intended for the addressee or not, and to the delivery in March last of a letter to a John Patterson intended for her husband, John T. Patterson, as well as to the disposal of certain newspapers delivered to her in error.

Now, these were some of the charges, and what is the finding?

There hardly seems to be sufficient grounds in the evidence of the petitioners to support the charges of mismanagement of the office.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. LOUNT. Quite true, but there may be reasons why the postmaster should be discharged, apart from the question of mismanagement, if her conduct is, as it is shown to be, overbearing or tyrannical. That would justify the dismissal of a postmaster. Now, let us read further:

That there is considerable ill-feeling between those of the petitioners who gave evidence and the postmaster is, on the other hand, quite apparent.

Showing that the people in that locality who were making the charges and who were to be served, had considerable ill-feeling produced in their breasts by the conduct of the postmistress. Then, again, the report states:

I would state that from inquiries made among the people of the place generally, there is a feeling that the postmaster and her assistant, Mr. McManus, her husband, are somewhat overbearing in their conduct to many people visiting the office, and several instances were brought to my notice, trivial in themselves, where more judi-

Mr. LOUNT.

icious treatment might have avoided more or less unpleasantness.

The gist of this, and the ground of the dismissal, and the ground on which it is warranted—and I venture to say every fair-minded member in this House and every fair-minded man in the country will approve it—is that the conduct of both the husband and wife was overbearing towards many visiting the office. I would ask if, in a public office, whether a post office or any other office where civil servants are employed, their conduct is to be allowed to be overbearing? Is such overbearing conduct to be permitted to continue? I will not say that walking around with a weapon behind the post office partition would be a cause for dismissal in the opinion of the hon. member for Assiniboia, whose courage has been shown on all occasions both in the House and out of it, but if the conduct of the postmaster and her assistant was such as to be overbearing, then I venture to say it is a cause for dismissal; and so far as my investigation of the case goes, I thoroughly and cordially support the conduct of the Postmaster General in taking action under such circumstances.

Motion to adjourn, negatived.

#### WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding:

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, before taking into consideration the new tariff that has been submitted by the Government for the approval of this House, I will endeavour to pay my addresses shortly to hon. gentlemen opposite who have criticised the tariff, some of whom have shown that they quite misunderstand the intention of the Government, and have expressed doubt as to the result of the application of that clause which provides for closer trade relations with the mother country. My hon. friend from Assinibola (Mr. Davin) and other hon. members stated that they could not understand how that clause could be applied under present conditions in so far as Great Britain is related to other nations. Permit me to say that it is quite evident that if hon. gentlemen opposite do not understand the new tariff and the application of the preferential clause to our trade with Great Britain, some of the constituencies that have been recently appealed to have clearly indicated that they understand it. Winnipeg clearly understands the new tariff. Yesterday it returned a supporter of the Government by over 1,100 majority. Then there was Macdonald. That constituency was represented by a Conservative and supporter of the late Government, and the voters there clearly understand the tariff, for they de-