

want any more of it. I might dwell a good deal on the appointment of the commissioner who made the investigation, and the action that my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, took on it, but I prefer not. I might read Senator Flint's speeches in this House; you remember the character he gave that commissioner. Senator Flint said that he was sent there for the purpose of white-washing Mr. Ellis, and that the leader of the government and the Minister of Customs knew him well enough and should not have sent him there.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—I do not propose to take up the time of the House with any remarks. We have discussed this subject pretty thoroughly, but I would just call the attention of the hon. gentleman to what the late government did in the dismissal of two officers in Winnipeg, Colonel Villiers and Major Street. The only notice they had of dismissal was seeing their names in the *Gazette*. To be sure, they got an allowance of one year's pay for their services, but that is all, after a long service as officers of the country.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (B.C.)—No one denies that.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—It was an arbitrary dismissal, not of opponents, but to make way for one of the same party. I thoroughly sympathize with the hon. gentleman from Victoria in all he has said with regard to the hardships that have to be borne by those who lost their positions at a moment's notice for no other cause than that the government has changed. But at the same time, we cannot hold ourselves, the Conservative party, blameless in a great many instances. I say it is a great hardship to dismiss two officers like those men, because their circumstances were not very good, and I am told they feel the loss of their income more than the labouring men, because they are not able to turn their hands to anything else. I hope myself to see the day when old-age pensions will be extended throughout the country. When the country will be able to take up such a question as that I am not able to say, but I do not like to see any one turned adrift in old age, after having served the country for a number of years, without receiving a pension of some kind or other, in order to protect him for the rest of his life from want. The question has been

pretty well discussed, and the general sentiment of the House, and the expressions we have heard from the leader of the House, give us the assurance that these dismissals are not to be of a wholesale character, but that they are simply isolated cases in one or two portions of the country.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I have no desire to enter into a discussion of the cases to which many hon. members have alluded: were I to do so, I could give very good reasons in defence of the action of the late government. These reasons can be found in Hansard, therefore it is unnecessary for me to repeat them. I could give an answer also to other charges with reference to myself. These, however, I shall allow to pass without occupying the time of the House in discussing them. I claim no credit in reference to the case to which I called the attention of the House when we were discussing this question the other day. I merely mentioned that case to show that although a strong political friend of the government had made serious complaints against a public officer, the Minister of Railways at the time, after taking very great pains to ascertain whether the charges were sufficient in his judgment to cause the discharge of the official, declined to discharge him. I merely mention that fact to show the care that was taken by the government in every case of complaint, before any action was decided upon, and not with any desire to claim any virtue for myself. I was not the Minister of Railways and Canals; I was acting for some time—I am not sure whether at the time the investigation was made or not. My object in rising now is simply to place before the Senate, in as few words as I can, a justification for the course pursued with reference to the inspectors of weights and measures throughout the Dominion at the time the late Judge Baby, then Minister of Inland Revenue, introduced his bill repealing the Act then upon the statute-book. Whether some of the gentlemen who were then removed should not have been reappointed is a question I am not prepared to discuss at present, for the simple reason that I am not in a position to say whether the minister at the time was justified or not in the course he adopted, but I hold in my hand a statement published in Hansard, and I ask my hon. friends who desire to know the facts, to turn