

ward Island? What was the nature of the charges preferred against him, if any? Has he been furnished with a copy of those charges? Has he been given an opportunity to defend himself against those charges? Has his case been examined by Mr. Palmer, the investigating commissioner? If not, why not?

The **POSTMASTER GENERAL** (Mr. Mullock). At the request of a number of the residents, the post office which had formerly been conducted in Mr. Martin's house, was removed to what was indicated to be a more convenient site, which occasioned a change of postmasters.

#### DISMISSAL OF DR. GEO. MITCHELL.

Mr. **CLANCY** asked :

1. Was Dr. George Mitchell dismissed from the position of physician to the Indians of Walpole Island, on charges of political partisanship?

2. If so, by whom were such charges made?

3. Was the said Dr. George Mitchell given an opportunity to answer such charges?

4. If not, why not?

5. Have the Government any rule to guide them in dismissing officials on charges of political partisanship with and without investigation into such charges?

The **MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR** (Mr. Sifton). 1. He was dismissed for political partisanship. 2. No formal charges of political partisanship were made against Dr. George Mitchell, but evidence was afforded the department that Dr. Mitchell was vice-president of the Liberal-Conservative Association, and as such took an active part in political affairs. 3 and 4. The facts were so notorious that it was not considered necessary to call upon Dr. Mitchell for a defence. 5. Where the partisanship is notorious and undeniable it is not deemed necessary to waste time and public money in holding investigations.

#### TUG "SILVER SPRAY" AND SCHOONER "MARY GROVER."

Mr. **WOOD** (Brockville) asked :

1. Were the tug "Silver Spray" and the schooner "Mary Grover," or either of them, seized for infraction of the revenue laws of the Dominion during the year 1883 or 1884, or either of said years?

2. If said vessels or either of them were so seized, what was the nature of the offence for which they, or either of them was so seized?

3. What was the name of the officer who seized said vessels or either of them?

4. Were said vessels or either of them released? If so, upon what terms?

5. Was an investigation subsequently held? If so, what was the name of the officer who conducted said investigation? Where was it held? What was the names of the witnesses examined at said investigation? Was their evidence reduced to writing and returned to the department, and is the same now on the files of the department?

6. Was final disposition made of the matter?

7. What was the name of the owner or owners of said vessels?

Mr. **MARTIN**.

8. By whom were the sworn entries made at Port Arthur or Michipicoten (or wherever the same were made) of the cargoes of said vessels?

9. Were the original entries and the invoices accompanying same returned to the Department of Customs, and are the same now on file in said department?

The **CONTROLLER OF CUSTOMS** (Mr. Paterson). The department have been making all diligence to secure the information for the hon. gentleman, but he will understand that it is an old matter, and requires a good deal of search. If he will be kind enough to let it stand until the next occasion for putting the question, I will be ready to answer him.

#### FAST ATLANTIC STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Before taking up the notices of motion, I should like to draw the attention of the House to a very important matter, and in order to put myself right, I will conclude with a motion. The matter to which I wish to draw attention is the condition of the proposed fast Atlantic service. The Minister of Trade and Commerce stated to this House a day or two ago that a contract had been made. I think the hon. gentleman said, with Messrs. Peterson, Tate & Company for the performance of that service. I think, Mr. Speaker, we have again reason to complain that this House and the people of this country should be obliged to obtain information with respect to matters of great and pressing importance from parties outside of this House, and in this as well as in other cases, from the other side of the Atlantic. The Parliament of the United Kingdom it appears is first to be informed of contracts made by this Government in relation to matters affecting this country. I do not raise this question at all in any factious spirit or with a view of calling the attention specially of the House to the discourtesy, I may almost call it, with which the Government treats the House as regards these questions. The late Minister of Agriculture asked the hon. Finance Minister the other day if an Order in Council had been passed granting a large sum of public money to the Grand Trunk Railway Company in connection with services to be rendered at Montreal. The Finance Minister promptly informed my hon. friend that he could not tell him whether that was the case or not. But I find on looking at the London "Times" of April 1st a communication from the correspondent of that paper stating that an Order in Council had been passed granting a large sum of public money to that company. I think it is of very great importance that the Government should take the House into their confidence in relation to matters that are of great public interest, and the people of the country should not be compelled to learn what has been done in relation to important pub-