

his dismissal comes to him on the 26th of May, or some time early in May, 1891. Here is the whole secret. There was no thought of removing him, and I venture to say that if Mr. Torey had taken his usual course and had supported the Government candidate, as in previous elections, we would not have heard a word said about his dismissal, and about this hatching of an excuse for dismissing him. Mr. Ross was dismissed at a month's notice, because no election was pending, but Mr. Torey was kept on. There is a general impression in the county amongst both Tories and Liberals, that Mr. Torey's head was cut off on account of his declining to vote. More than that, one of the largest petitions ever presented to the Government in favour of any one, signed by over a thousand men on both sides of politics in the County of Guysborough, including some of the strongest supporters of the Government in the county, was sent to the department about Mr. Torey. But Mr. Torey being a little inclined towards independence just about the time of the election, his past services all went for nothing, his past services to the Government were thought nothing of, and it was concluded that a blow must be struck at him to learn him and to learn all others that if they dared, when an election came on, to refrain from voting, they must understand that the law will be put into operation. Now, if Mr. Torey was an officer who had neglected his duty, there might be some excuse for his dismissal, but even if there had been a violation of the law I claim that he, as an officer who had been twenty years in the service and done his duty to the satisfaction of the Government, ought to have been treated with more consideration. Everybody in the county will tell you that he did his duty so far as he was concerned, and likewise in aiding others and doing what he could to stop smuggling, doing all that he could in the interest of the Government, and I say there ought to have been some consideration shown to an officer of that character. Is a man to be dismissed for one violation of the law? When I consider the further fact that he had grown old in that office, being now over 60 years of age, I think the conduct of the Government was reprehensible in dismissing him. I am not a political friend of Mr. Torey, he does not happen to be a supporter of mine, he did not vote for my party, and I do not think he ever once voted for the Liberal party in that county. His whole influence and the influence of his family were opposed to the party with which I am connected. But that makes no difference; I would claim for him the same rights that I would claim for a supporter of mine. I am bound to say that, although Mr. Torey was opposed to me, he was a good officer, and I claim that the Government ought not to have acted as they did towards that man. Why need his alleged offence go so long unpunished? Why not deal with it at once, if it was such a flagrant violation of the law? Why keep him on without saying a word to him about it? But an occasion arose when the Government, finding that Mr. Torey was independent and would not vote for the Government candidate, decided to dismiss him. Now, here let me say that so far as his knowledge is concerned in comparison with the man that was appointed in his place, it was like the knowledge of the Minister of Marine as compared with the knowledge of his youngest child. He knows just as much more about fisheries than

the man the Government appointed as the Minister of Marine knows more than his infant child. I do not say that the new officer is not a respectable man; but he was a small huckster in the village, he knew nothing about anything except selling a few goods. Mr. Torey had been in the service for over twenty years, and had been a commandant of Government vessels. There is nothing in that service that Mr. Torey does not know. There is not an inch of the county that he does not know. He himself supervised all the officers of the Government in the county; indeed he was the Government in that county, he was the whole Government in the county. He collected their Customs, and looked after their fisheries, and everything of that kind. I say that the Government have done a wrong to a man who has been in the Civil Service for twenty years, and no complaint has ever been found against him. Mr. Torey is up as early as any man in that county. I have known him to leave before daylight to perform his duty. But he is declared to be an old man now, and so he must be laid aside. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that both things are joined together. The Government were conscious that they could not dismiss him for the first reason, and so they found a second reason. The first reason was not sufficient, and, therefore, for the first time, they bring up his age against him. They say: You are getting too old; the Governor General is told that you are too old. I suppose the Governor General thought that he was a decrepit old man like some of the officers we see about the departments, sunning themselves on the lawn, and not able to move about, and consequently the Governor General thought it was in the interest of the service that he should be dismissed. I venture to say, if all the facts in regard to that seizure were brought before the Governor General and Mr. Torey's explanation was considered, the Governor General would not have dismissed him for that cause. It is a serious matter for all officials if they are to be treated in this way. I shall be very glad to hear what explanation can be given. Technically there was a violation of the law by the official, but I hold that there is no official of Mr. Torey's age in the Dominion who has performed his duties so well for twenty years and made so few mistakes. No one indeed, ever heard that he made a mistake before, and yet for that one mistake, and he claimed it was impossible for him to do otherwise, he is removed. If he had not accepted \$800 as a fine the vessel would have gone out to sea, and at Canso there were many American vessels which might have taken the part of the vessel in question, and accordingly, in my opinion, Mr. Torey acted wisely. Where could he obtain men to make an arrest? The people were not in sympathy with action in the direction of arresting the vessel after this offer of \$800 was made. It was not a case where the captain declared he would resist the law and get away. But when the people found the vessel had offered \$800 for the violation of the law, they were in sympathy with it, and it was a question whether the officer should accept the amount or let the vessel go without punishment. That explanation was satisfactory to the Government at the time; and hence their silence, until Mr. Torey failed to come out and vote at the last election. I am simply claiming for him what I would claim for any official. I have nothing to gain from this matter; Mr. Torey