

and asked the hon. minister if he would be kind enough to tell me what was the complaint against Mr. Sutherland and further requested that he would be kind enough to give Mr. Sutherland a trial. I waited for more than a week but I got no reply to my letter. I have had no reply yet although that letter was written weeks ago. I brought the matter up in the House and I endeavoured to extract from my hon. friend some information with regard to it. He informed me on that occasion that when I was through with my speech he would give me the information. That happened some time ago, but he has not yet honoured me by giving me any information with regard to the dismissal of Mr. Sutherland. It could not be done on the word of any sitting member because there is no member from Guysborough except myself. It must have been done on the recommendation of a defeated candidate or some one else. We were told in the House the other day by the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) that the policy of the government was that when a defeated candidate asked for the dismissal of an official there would be an investigation and evidence required.

A number of dismissals have been made in my constituency on the recommendation of the defeated candidate, and there have been no investigations, and no charges made, so far as I can find out.

Mr. MONK. I did not get a request from anybody for an investigation.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Why, in Sutherland's case the minister has my letter requesting an investigation which he has not honoured with a reply, and he has my further request from my seat in this House. It is not asked that there should be a long trial, like that into the conduct of Warren Hastings, but we protest against the Star Chamber manner in which he is carrying out these dismissals. There is no department in the government where such cruel and unheard of things have been done as in the department of the hon. gentleman. If he only carried out the principles he has announced in the House all would be well, but when we know of our knowledge he is not doing so, I will not sit here without entering my protest.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The papers have stated that the Minister of Public Works has appointed a gentleman in Ottawa to conduct an investigation into the charges made against officials in the Public Works Department. Is that true?

Mr. MONK. Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is the name of the gentleman?

Mr. MONK. Mr. Hector Chauvin has been appointed to investigate the applications for dismissals in Ottawa.

Mr. SINCLAIR.

Mr. H BOULAY (Rimouski). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, our hon. friends on the side of the House are very touchy in regard to these dismissals, when their supporters are affected; but I may be allowed to submit certain particulars which are not generally known and especially to recall some of their doings of 1896 and the years following. I still remember the deeds of almost incredible savagery which were committed by the Liberal party in 1896 on reaching power. I propose recalling a few of them in support of my contention. I shall quote letters written by certain officials of the Railway Department dismissing our friends without even giving them the two weeks' notice provided by statute. Here is a letter dated Campbellton, January, 1899, to Mr. Théophile Michaud, section foreman at Amqui:

Dear Sir,—I am instructed to notify you that after the 15th of the present month your services will be dispensed with. This will give you the usual 14 days' notice. Please acknowledge receipt of this letter.

Yours truly,

JAMES PATTERSON.

No reason is given for such dismissal.

Another letter, dated October 28, 1896, from River du Loup, to Mr. George Dubé's address reads as follows:

George Dubé, Esq.,

Sectionman,

St. Alexandre.

Sir,—I am instructed by the chief engineer to notify you that your services will no longer be required as sectionman on the Intercolonial railway. You will, therefore, consider yourself discharged after the 31st of this month.

Yours truly,

JAMES YEO,

Trackmaster.

As will be seen, it was only a short time after the former government had come into power. That man wrote to the department to obtain particulars, and the answer sent to him was as follows:

Moncton, Nov. 2, 1896.

Mr. George Dubé,

Ex-Section Man,

St. Alexandre Station, P.Q.

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 30th ult., asking the reasons for your discharge from the service.

I do not know of any reports against you. My order was from the general manager and was repeated to Mr. Yeo.

Yours truly,

P. S. ARCHIBALD,

Chief Engineer.

Now, that is only a sample of what was going on in 1896. And in my constituency where there are about a thousand civil servants, a clean sweep was effected throughout the county of poor sectionmen on the Intercolonial, most of whom