

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He was returned on the 16th.

Mr. TAYLOR. His name appears in the *Gazette* on the 19th.

Mr. EDGAR. Immediately after being returned.

An hon. MEMBER. Gazetted before he was returned perhaps.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Addington (Mr. Bell) was gazetted on the 19th of March. The hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) was gazetted on the 19th. I was gazetted on the 19th of March. The hon. member for North Leeds and Greenvile (Mr. Ferguson) was gazetted on the 26th of March, and the hon. member for West Peterboro' (Mr. Stevenson) was gazetted on the 26th April. Now none of these gentlemen are complaining of the acts of the returning officers. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Burdett) insinuates that not only the returning officers, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and other officials are corrupt, but he insinuates that the postmaster would deface the register book in order to assist the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in proving that certain letters had not arrived on a particular day. I am surprised at the hon. gentleman saying that he had made arrangements with the people at Belleville that there would be no protest there if there would be none against him, knowing that if my hon. friend from West Hastings (Mr. Robertson) was guilty of corrupt acts, it was his duty as an honorable man not to be a party to a corrupt bargain. If he knew that the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Robertson) had violated the law, it was his duty to say: Yes, he will be prosecuted; I will take my chances, for I have done nothing wrong. But he could not say that; he made this bargain, and he said that if he was gazetted on the same day as the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Robertson) there would be no protest in that case. But he did not blame the hon. member for West Hastings for being a party to the protest, but he blamed somebody else. I think he has himself and his friends to blame for the protest being filed. I could have told him the next day after the election, and why? A couple of his constituents worked in Gananoque, and one of his leading friends wrote down, telling them: We are going to have a hard fight; Burdett wants you on the 22nd to vote for him; you may be sworn; we cannot promise you anything, but come—it will be all right. Those two gentlemen got these letters, and they were advised not to go on these letters, for "we have money in hand." They wrote up to their friends stating that they could not afford to go and pay their own expenses. They received another letter telling them to go to a certain individual in Gananoque who was working for a lumber firm, and would see that they got paid. Those two gentlemen went there and saw that individual, were furnished with funds, and went up to East Hastings and recorded their votes. The hon. gentleman finds fault because the protest was not served on him until the last day. He had a right, perhaps, to find fault because he was not served on the first day; but I suppose that is the experience of all gentlemen on either side of the House. The law is the same for hon. gentlemen on that side as it is for those on this side of the House. If any hon. gentleman on this side did a corrupt act during the election, it was their duty to see that his election was protested, as hon. gentlemen on this side have seen fit to protest the seats of hon. gentlemen opposite. Of course the Conservative party have always been charged with being the corrupt party of this country; but it has always been proved in the courts that hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends are the party who have done the most corrupt acts in the election campaigns.

Mr. McMULLEN. Sir John in Kingston.

Mr. TAYLOR. What about Sir John in Kingston?

Mr. McMULLEN. He was unseated.

Mr. TAYLOR. When?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can tell you; in 1874, for a corrupt act of himself or his friends.

Mr. TAYLOR. What was the act?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The most corrupt of acts, and he was only spared by the lenity of the judge. If the hon. gentleman wishes to know, Chief Justice Richards declared that he never had more hesitation in not disqualifying a man in his life.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. gentleman will move, I will second a motion for a special committee to look up precedents in the courts to show which party has the cleanest record in election trials. I am willing to stake the reputation of hon. gentlemen around me that the white glove will not be handed to my hon. friend who made the statement about Sir John in Kingston. Now, until hon. gentlemen opposite will rise and say: "The returning officer in my riding did me a wrong," I am not prepared to have that returning officer dragged before an election committee of this House to have his conduct investigated. I found out, when I was home, why my return was not made sooner. I got my certificate about the 1st of March that I was the elected candidate for South Leeds, and when I was home I asked the returning officer why I was not gazetted sooner. He said: "The fact was, that after I made out the statement, I got a telegram stating that my son, who was in the United States, was ill; I went to see him, and the return remained until I came back." So he did not send it down to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery until the 12th of March, when it was received here, and I am gazetted on the 19th.

Mr. BLAKE. It was received on the 14th.

Mr. TAYLOR. Be that as it may, the returning officer perhaps should have had his return in sooner, because my election was settled without any trouble, and the returns were all in within two or three days after the election. But that was the excuse the returning officer gave me, and it was a valid excuse; and until hon. gentlemen opposite make a specific charge against any of these returning officers of having done them a gross injustice, I am not prepared to bring them before a committee of this House, but am ready to believe that they did what was fair and proper, as Tories always do.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat is a delightful example of that wonderful product of our constitution, the innocent Tory member. He examined the returns of half a dozen constituencies that returned Conservative members, and discovering in every instance that they had been gazetted within a day or two after the return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, he asks in innocent surprise, what have the members of this House to complain of? It never struck him, I suppose that there were members on this side of the House who were not dealt with in the same way. The motion of the hon. member for Bothwell is based on that very fact, that members on this side have not been dealt with by the ministerial officers of the Crown as those officers have dealt with hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. Boyle), who spoke this afternoon, appeared to be very much dissatisfied that the time of the House should be wasted, as he said, by those petty squabbles over the elections.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. The sentiment appears to be cheered by hon. gentlemen who share the opinion; but I think a little reflection will show them that the taking of proper steps by this House to assert its own dignity and liberties, and to condemn the wrong-doing of those officers who have been