

to page 1340 of the Hansard of 1882 (May 6th), in which they will find a tabulated statement which was laid upon the table of the House showing why these removals, if such they may be termed (because they were legislated out of existence), were made. The headings of the table are as follows:—

- The division to which the officer was appointed.
- The officer's name.
- The date of the Order in Council.
- The date when salaries commenced.
- The date when standards were supplied.
- The date on which operations began.
- The number of days employed.
- The amount of salary drawn during the periods the officers were employed.

Every division, every officer's name, the number of days employed—all are given in this tabulated statement, and I find that in Ontario alone there were paid to these officers who had not done a single day's work (not having been supplied with the necessary apparatus and standards to enable them to perform their work, for which I find no fault with the officers themselves) was \$18,784.44. In the province of Quebec the money spent in payment of officers who had done nothing was \$20,048.54. In connection with the officer to whom my hon. friend from Iberville refers, I find that he was appointed on the 30th September, 1875, and on the 3rd November of the same year, his salary began. The date when the standards were supplied was July 18th, 1876, and the date on which operations began—that is when he began work—was November 4th, 1876. The number of days unemployed—that is, the number of days on which he had nothing to do (not being able to perform any work for want of apparatus, the government not having provided the necessary standards, etc., to enable him to do so), was 463 days; so that he was paid \$631.62 for doing nothing. So far was this carried that you will find on referring to this statement that an inspector of weights and measures was appointed for Labrador. Whoever supposed that a weights and measures inspector was required for that part of the country? How much do you suppose this gentleman got during the time he occupied that office without doing a single hour's work? It amounted to \$8,106.89. I will not particularize further. In New Brunswick the amount spent in the manner that I have indicated was \$6,164.65; in Nova Scotia, \$4,981.38; in Manitoba, \$770.

Hon. Mr. POWER—Those officers were paid by salary I suppose?

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Yes. What I am showing is that the amount of money that those gentlemen received for doing nothing was very large. In Prince Edward Island the amount was small—only \$345.45, and in British Columbia only \$74.97. The total amount thrown away by the negligence of the government in not furnishing those officers with the proper instruments to enable them to perform the work was \$52,382.32. When Mr. Baby took charge of the office and found the department in this state, was he not justified in repealing the Act and by repealing the Act dispensing with the expenditure of so large an amount of money for which no return was made? The object in repealing that statute was to enact another law at some later period by which that particular branch of the department could be put upon a sounder, a more solid and more economical basis. If I were to read the whole of this statement, which covers a number of pages, not only in connection with this one branch of it but the whole, it would show the best possible justification of the course taken by the government in the removal of those officers under the circumstances.

Hon. Mr. McCLELAN—What complaint was there against the officers?

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The complaint was that the law on the statute book placed in the hands of the government the appointment of some 60 officers and that they kept them in their employ with nothing for them to do.

Hon. Mr. McCLELAN—That was not their fault.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I did not say that it was. I said, when I began my remarks, that I found no fault with them. The reappointment of the weights and measures inspectors was another thing altogether. The repeal of the law removed these gentlemen from office just as the repeal of other laws to which I might call my hon. friend's attention wiped officials appointed under them out of existence; and that when appointments were subsequently made under other arrangements, I have no doubt that the government selected them from amongst their friends. The officer