

"Strict in the discharge of his duties, especially in his collection of all demands he might have against us as importers, also courteous and obliging in his business relations; that the steadily increasing revenue of the port is a fair answer to the charges of being inactive for the prevention of smuggling." I believe if the facts were known, it would be found that it was because of his political leanings, rather than want of efficiency in the discharge of his duties, that he was dismissed.

Mr. WADE. I wish to state that the member for Digby had nothing to do with the matter at all. It was wholly and solely the doing of the hon. member for Annapolis.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). This gentleman was a Sub Collector at the port of Digby.

Mr. LONGLEY. I think the hon. member for Shelburne is mistaken in saying that Mr. Morse was a Sub-Collector at the port of Digby. He is a resident of the county of Annapolis, and I presume I shall be obliged to bear all the blame of his dismissal, if, after full investigation, there is found to be any blame to be attached to anyone. The papers, I think, will show that Mr. Morse was not dismissed at my suggestion, but on the report of this very Mr. Wolff to whom reference has been made. To show the moderation that has characterized my action, I need not tell the House that, during the *regime* of our opponents, they made all the appointments they possibly could, and that we have a great preponderance of them among the office holders in the county of Annapolis. Yet I am not sensible of having desired to dismiss any man on purely political grounds: first, because it is a vicious principle, and, secondly, because it usually tends more to the injury of those who are instrumental in the dismissal than anybody else, for, after you get a man dismissed your difficulties just begin. Even before the dismissal is made, in long anticipation of it, you have about one hundred and fifty applications for the vacant position. So looking at the matter in all its aspects I do not think there is any great desire in the mind of any representative even for the dismissal of his political opponents.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no objection to bringing down the report of the Inspector on which Mr. Morse was dismissed, and I think, when it is read to the House, they will come to the conclusion that he was very properly dismissed. I can assure my hon. friend for Shelburne that he was not dismissed on account of his political opinions. I can readily understand why no particular noise has been made about the dismissal of any other Customs officer in Nova Scotia, because I take it for granted that my hon. friend for Shelburne would not make any noise about any dismissal that happened to be a deserved one. There have only been two dismissals of Custom-house officers in Nova Scotia—one a strong Conservative, and this one who, I now learn from my hon. friend, was on the other side of politics; and when I tell the House that Mr. Morse was reported to have allowed goods to go out of bond, and to go into consumption without collecting duty on them, I think they will admit that to be sufficient to justify the removal of any Customs officer; and when a Collector of Customs is instructed to ask an importer to amend an entry which has been improperly made, and which, when amended will cause him to pay a higher duty, and he holds out to that importer an inducement that if he amends this entry and pays the duty on this article he will make it up to him on some other article that he imports, I think that is sufficient to justify the dismissal of the officer. These are the two charges principally upon which Mr. Morse was dismissed. The latter charge is sustained by the affidavit of the importer to whom the proposition was made by the Collector of Customs. If that can be tolerated in any part of the Dominion, I have yet to learn it will be in the interests of the Customs Department, or any other department, to retain such officers in their employ.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman is under the impression that the dismissal was made by the Government; but the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Longley) is under the impression that the dismissal was made by him. The hon. gentleman held himself responsible for that action and has told the House of the difficulties arising in consequence of the dismissal: that he had 150 applicants for the position as soon as the vacancy took place.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not so understand the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Longley). If he did make that statement I may say that the dismissal did not take place upon his representation. Neither was it upon any complaints he made to the department in respect to the conduct of this officer, but altogether in consequence of the representation of merchants and others who resided there.

Mr. MILLS. There is a delusion somewhere.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The delusion is attempted to be made by the hon. member for Bothwell. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Longley) distinctly stated that he had not asked for this dismissal, and was quite prepared to assume the blame and the responsibility, which might attach to the party who had revived the investigation into the conduct of the officer; but the hon. gentleman had distinctly stated that he had not even asked for his dismissal. Therefore a delusion was attempted to be created by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills).

Mr. KILLAM. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Longley) may have been misunderstood. He stated first that he would be quite willing to take all the blame for the officer's dismissal, and a short time afterwards he said he had nothing to do with it.

Mr. LONGLEY. I think I stated, as distinctly as it was possible to state anything, that I had asked for a second investigation, and that I was willing to bear the responsibility of that request. I said, if blame was to be attached to any one, I would bear it; but we have not reached that conclusion.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). What I complain of is that Wolff was sent to report on the case in December, 1879, and after examining the office at Bear River and all the papers, he reported there was no ground whatever for the charge that had been made against Mr. Morse. That statement was publicly made known in the village, and afterwards published in the Nova Scotia press and not denied. On January 21st, 1880, Wolff wrote to Morse from Brockville:

"Will you kindly advise me of the result of departmental instructions *in re* smuggling in the *Maggie Blanche*? Is the vessel seized, and have you received the fine from Bogart and Miller; and what other evidence did you or the collector receive in regard to the matter? I want to know all about the matter for my own private information."

Mr. Wolff did not visit Bear River after he wrote that letter' but three months after receiving that report the Government dismissed the officer at Bear River without giving him a chance to reply to the charge. That is the charge I make against the Government.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has referred to a conversation at Bear River, and has said that Mr. Wolff made certain statements. I had not a spy there to ascertain what Mr. Wolff said. The department received the report of its officer, and I know nothing of correspondence between Wolff and Morse on any other matter. It did not come under the cognizance of the department. Neither am I aware of any conversation he may have had with Mr. Morse, nor is there any record in the department which will justify the statement made or the impression which the hon. gentleman endeavored to leave on the House that Wolff had reported that he was perfectly satisfied as to the way Morse's office was conducted. There is no such document in the