

to be examined before that committee. If there is one thing clearer than another, it is that in practice, as everybody knows, a gross injustice has been done to members of this House by subjecting them to the threat of an election petition for many days later than the vast majority of members on the other side have been subjected to it. I have never, in all my experience, had an election petition presented against me, but the First Minister has had many, and has not come very well out of them; and he must know that it is not a pleasant thing to have, that it is a disagreeable and a costly thing. Why, Sir, he knows perfectly that if you succeed in unseating a man, you have got to pay a round sum over and above all that the courts will allow. I think a recent hon. member of this House, my esteemed friend, Mr. Allison, can testify to that fact, and probably the hon. gentleman could, too, of his own personal experience. Sir, I repeat, first of all, that if the law is correctly laid down by my hon. friend from Bothwell—I did not hear the First Minister or any gentleman who rose on that side dispute the law—*prima facie*, the Clerk of Chancery has deliberately disobeyed the law; and it must be remembered that, after the answer which was made to my hon. friend by the First Minister himself, we are justified in presuming that that gentleman did so under pressure put upon him by members of the Government. Sir, I say that if this House has any respect for itself, has any regard for fair play, honor or decency, it will insist on having an investigation, either before a special committee, or before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and I take it my hon. friend does not care which. But I call again attention to the fact that the member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt)—if my ears did not entirely deceive me—has stated in his place, he has brought forward strong corroborative evidence that show that this officer has, in his case, deliberately made a false return in the paper which is now before us. Surely no man is going to say that when a member of this House makes such a charge against an officer of ours, there is not a case for investigation before a competent tribunal.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to address a few observations to the House before this motion is put. One hon. gentleman has asked us what we have to complain of. Sir, we have this to complain of, that the law has been flagrantly violated by an officer of this House. I called the attention of the House to a great many cases. I have pointed out that upwards of 60 members returned to the House on this side were not gazetted as the law required; I have pointed out that the time of a very considerable number was delayed not merely for a week, but for several weeks, and that members who were returned after they had been returned, were gazetted before them. After I was elected my return was received by this officer on the 10th, and I can name a dozen gentlemen sitting opposite who were returned on the same day, and they were gazetted on the 12th. On the 12th I was not gazetted, on the 19th I was not gazetted, on the 26th I was not gazetted. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), the Minister of Finance, representing the constituency of Cumberland, the Minister of Justice, were all returned on the 11th, they were gazetted on the 12th. Does any hon. gentleman pretend to say that was in compliance with the law? What are the words in the statute? It says:

"The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall, on receiving the return of any member elected to the House of Commons, give notice in the next ordinary issue of the *Gazette*."

Did the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery give this notice in my case, did he in the case of my hon. friends on my right and left, did he in the case of the hon. member for Prince Edward, did he in the case of 60 other members of this House, enter the returns in the *Gazette* as required by law? Why, then, should we not enquire into these facts? Does the First

Minister or his colleagues say that this is not a necessary provision of the law? Does he say that it is not necessary that members of this House should stand upon a footing of equality in a matter of this kind? Sir, we know why these hon. gentlemen do not choose to allow my motion to pass; we know why they will not submit the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to be examined on oath. Why, Sir, I hold in my hands the Public Estimates, and they prove beyond all question why the First Minister and his colleagues are not willing that this officer shall be examined on oath. What is the information disclosed in these estimates? I find on looking at page 322 that he has received a salary of \$2,250, charged to the expenses of legislation. I find on looking at page 11 of these estimates that that officer is to be transferred from this House to the Privy Council, and to receive a salary of \$2,600. Now, will the First Minister tell this House when this resolution was come to? Will he tell us when it was found necessary to add \$350 to the salary of this officer who had so faithfully neglected his duty? Will the hon. gentleman tell us how it is that when an officer has violated his duty and his oath in sixty cases, that he finds it necessary to promote him? Why, Sir, hon. gentlemen who sit on that side of the House can understand as well as those sitting on this side of the House, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that the country will understand why he has done this act. The country will understand why the hon. gentleman has seen proper to promote a man who is guilty of perjury, who instead of conforming to the law has set the law at defiance, who, instead of doing as the law has directed him, has done as hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches have directed him, in the face of the law, and who propose to reward him at our expense for this nefarious violation of duty. We have here in the case of this officer a mean unprincipled minion of authority, who is ready to play the janissary for those gentlemen, and to play the assassin on members on this side of the House. That is the position which this officer occupies before this country, and the people will understand the position assigned him by the hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches. They will know why this officer ceased to be an officer connected with this House, and became an officer connected with the Privy Council; they will understand why he is promoted, and why it is proposed to add \$350 to his salary; it is because the law has said that he shall gazette members who are returned in the next *Gazette*, and he has refused to do so. It is because the law has said that thirty days from the time after the gazetting of members in the next *Gazette* shall be allowed for contesting the seats of members, and he has added thirty days to the time fixed by the law as against members on this side of the House. Why, Sir, we see in the case of one hon. member sitting there how he has had his head taken out of the noose, and how it has been kept on the neck of an hon. gentleman on this side of the House. We can understand this, and I tell hon. gentlemen who have been elected to support the leader of the Administration, and are disposed to follow him in this offence, this conspiracy between the Government and the Clerk of the Crown—I say the country will understand what has been done by the Ministry in this matter. Sir, I am ready to vote on this question, and I dare say that every hon. gentleman on this side of the House is ready to vote, and we will see the First Minister proposing his motion preventing this man from being examined on oath before a committee of this House. We shall see the First Minister playing in this matter the same sort of show, giving to the House and to the country the same kind of exhibition, that was given here during the Pacific scandal. Why don't the hon. gentleman stand up and call heaven to witness, "these hands are clean?" Sir, we understand now why the hon. gentleman did not answer the questions I put to him the other day, and why he regarded them as impertinent, and why it would have been