

200 men were dismissed in the province of Manitoba in one day. There was no investigation. When the man came back and asked why they were dismissed, they were told they were not wanted; that is all the satisfaction they got. The man who represented Selkirk at that time, Mr. Macdonell, after having been a party to some outrageous dismissals, stated on the floor of the House that he believed that the policy of the government was a good policy—to the victors belong the spoils.

That is the language he used in this House, and that it was cheered by hon. members opposite. I do not take that position; the party in power has not taken that position. But when officials become active partisans during the campaign, hon. gentlemen opposite ought not to complain if this government dismisses them.

Mr. CARROLL. What has been the wail of the hon. gentlemen' precious leader for the past fifteen years in regard to this matter?

Mr. BRADBURY. It is well enough for hon. gentlemen opposite to try to hide behind what has been said on this side, but they must be prepared to take the medicine they have given their opponents for fifteen years. The hon. member for Guysboro (Mr. Sinclair) in reading these letters said that nobody had asked for this man's dismissal except the man who wanted the position. And he read the letter from the defeated candidate. I think that letter is a complete indorsation of the charge made by Mr. Pyche.

Here is the letter, it speaks for itself, and shows that the hon. member for Guysborough has not treated the House fairly:

To the Hon. L. P. Pelletier, M.P.,
Postmaster General,

Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—The inclosed statement of Mr. Pyche as to Mr. Roderick Sutherland, who holds the position of janitor in the post office at Canso, N.S. You will note that this statement is supported by the officers of the Conservative Association at Canso. I beg to say that Mr. Pyche is a reliable person and that his statement as to Sutherland may be relied upon in the premises.

Yours very truly,

G. A. R. ROWLINGS,

Liberal-Conservative candidate,

Guysborough Co.,

September, 1911, election.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The defeated candidate makes no statement of his own; he simply says that the other man's statement may be relied upon.

Mr. BRADBURY. That is only splitting hairs; the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sinclair) knows that it is quibbling. The charge is made by one man, and the defeated candidate endorses that charge by telling the minister that the man who makes it can

Mr. BRADBURY.

be relied upon in the statement he makes regarding Sutherland. So, I submit this official has been dismissed on the recommendation of the defeated candidate who had the evidence. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) himself was willing that an official should be dismissed on the word of a member of this House, because the member took the responsibility. But if a candidate has been defeated through the work of partisan officials and writes a letter taking the full responsibility of asking for their dismissal, I hold that the hon. minister is justified in making that dismissal. The member for Guysborough dares not disagree with this. I am not in sympathy with some of the investigations the government are giving. They are showing too much consideration for hon. gentlemen opposite. For fifteen years there was a complete weeding out of Conservatives occupying positions in the public service from the Atlantic to the Pacific their places being filled with Liberals. And now, because these men are being removed for partisanship, hon. gentlemen opposite raise a howl to save them. For my part, I hope the government will have courage enough and will be fair enough to their friends to punish every official who has been guilty of partisanship.

Mr. SINCLAIR. In what I said I raised two points in regard to this case. The first was that there was no evidence against Mr. Sutherland, except the evidence of an interested witness which would not be taken in any court of justice in any British or other civilized country. The sole evidence is that of a witness who is interested so much that if he does not succeed in this application he will be out of a job. The defeated candidate, and these other gentlemen who have put their names down, do not venture to say that they know anything about the case. The other point I raised was with regard to the attitude of the leader of the hon. gentlemen opposite for fourteen years on this matter, and the results of it all to-day. And I submit that neither of these points has been answered.

Mr. PELLETIER. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sinclair) consider it sufficient ground for the dismissal of an officer that a member of the House had written saying that he had been credibly informed that the official was an offensive partisan?

Mr. SINCLAIR. No.

Mr. PELLETIER. I will produce the record of a case in which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sinclair), did that himself.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I do not think the hon. minister can do it.

Mr. PELLETIER. I will do it as soon as you like.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Do it now.