

decided that a man shall be deprived of everything except the right to vote, let it be so announced. But do not let us have one declaration of principle from one Minister and another from another Minister, and then have all these declarations treated as idle wind and scores of dismissals made of honest, industrious, efficient public servants without cause assigned, without explanation of any kind. Why, Sir, I know several cases of dismissals in which the parties have asked the Government: Is there any charge against me? Have I done anything wrong? Have you any ground of complaint? And the answer was: No, there is no charge whatever against you. And when these parties have asked: As I am not allowed to serve the country and am not in employment, will you give me a recommendation, will you allow the officials under whom I have served to say whether I have performed my duty in an honourable and straightforward manner? And this has been refused. So, Sir, it would appear that the policy of this Government is not only to drive men out of office, to deprive men who are honestly and faithfully serving the country of the positions they hold, but to starve them, if possible, by preventing them from getting employment elsewhere. There has been an amount of cruelty, an amount of injustice, an amount of unfairness in dealing with the public officials of this country during the short regime of the present Government, that, when it is summed up before this House—as I hope it will be, for I shall move a resolution that a list of the employees discharged, either without cause assigned, shall be laid upon the Table—will startle this House and this country. Assuming the sincerity of the statements—and I am not questioning it—made by my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister), I think nobody will be more astonished than he when this long list of officers who have been ruthlessly driven from office without cause or reason, except simply that some person else wished to occupy their place, is submitted to this House. But this policy of dismissals on one side from office is a policy that cannot be maintained. It is utterly impossible that it can be maintained by one party and not by another. The first duty that will be forced upon whoever may succeed these hon. gentlemen is to remove from office—and I say it here in the face of the House and of the country—every man who has taken the position of a man improperly driven out of the public service. And I can only say, so far as the officials are concerned, the principle propounded and laid down by gentlemen opposite will have to be applied to the officials of this country in the same way that they have applied it. The course they pursue will be forced upon their successors, and a condition will be brought about that every man who wants to see the civil service of this country preserve the high and independent character that it has

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

heretofore had, will deplore from the bottom of his heart. No person regrets it more deeply than I do. I feel there is no injury that this Government is inflicting upon this country greater or more serious than their endeavour to strike down all independence of character in the civil service and to terrorize the members of that service by giving them the impression that they must carry out the views of this Government or be driven out of office.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I would not have attempted to say a word but for the statement of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) who has just sat down, that the present Government have dismissed, within the short space of time that they have occupied the Treasury benches, more officers than were dismissed by the Conservative party in the eighteen years during which they were in power. I take exception to that statement. When the Conservatives came into power in 1878, they swept out of the service every officer they could possibly dismiss. I am only going to detain the House for a single moment to state one fact. The hon. leader of the Opposition, when he was in the Government in 1872, introduced a law in reference to weights and measures inspection. They were driven from power before they had time to put this law in operation. When the Government of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie came into power that Government had the opportunity of putting the law in operation and making the appointments in the weights and measures inspection service. When the Conservatives came back to power in 1878, the hon. gentleman who now leads the Opposition forgot all the good points of the measure he had introduced and thought it was not a good measure for the country, and he repealed it *holus bolus*. He could not see his way to dismiss the men individually, but he repealed the law and thus drove every man who had been in the Weights and Measures Inspection Department out of office at one sweep. The hon. gentleman himself was then the person to introduce a new Weights and Measures Act, and under that they appointed their own men in almost every instance all over the country, making up the weights and measures service much as it is to-day. But they did not stop even with this wholesale sweep. There was a gentleman occupying a high commercial position in Hamilton who had been appointed collector of customs at Niagara Falls. He occupied that position for a very short time. Nobody could find fault with him: a man competent in every way to discharge the duties of collector of customs. He was summarily dismissed from office; no complaint against him, but simply that he was a Reformer and always had been, and that was enough to bring down upon him the vengeance of the Government. The hon. leader of the Opposition would have us believe that he is the guardian of the civil ser-