

Government did wrong, it was the duty of hon. gentlemen, when on this side of the House, to bring their conduct before Parliament, and to see that they were condemned for it. But the statement is not well founded. I have the *Gazettes* before me to which the hon. gentleman's motion refers, and what do I find? The hon. gentleman read the names of a number of members who were gazetted first; why were they? Because the majority of them were elected by acclamation, and therefore their returns were in the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery before those of hon. gentlemen opposite, who were at that time under a cloud. I have a list of those names, and I find that among them the following gentlemen who were not Reformers, were gazetted on the 31st of January: Mr. Little, the member for North Simcoe; Mr. Ouimet, of Laval; Mr. Colby, of Stanstead; Mr. Masson, of Terrebonne; Mr. Dugas, of Montcalm; Mr. Lanthier, of Soulanges, and Mr. Desjardins, of Hochelaga. There were thirty-seven members gazetted at that time, twenty-five Reformers and twelve Conservatives, just about the proportion of the two parties in the House. Then, I find in the *Gazette* of 7th February, thirty-five members gazetted, twenty-three Reformers and twelve Conservatives, about the same proportion. The Conservatives constituted about one-third of the House. In the *Gazette* I find the names of Mr. McDougall, of Three Rivers; Mr. Ryan, of Montreal Centre; Mr. Pope, of Compton; Mr. Caron, of Quebec Centre; Mr. Baby, of Joliette; Mr. Alonzo Wright, of Ottawa County; Mr. Mousseau, Mr. McGreevy, Mr. Robillard and others. Then, in the *Gazette* of the 14th of February, I find the names of hon. gentlemen opposite, in proportion to their numbers, to be just as numerous as those of our friends. Do we find all the Conservatives left to be gazetted in the third or fourth *Gazette*, and all the Reformers in the first or second? Not at all. In this *Gazette* I find the names of Messrs. Dorion, Cheval, Bernier, Laurier, Fiset, Geoffrion, Huntington, Tremblay and Holton, from Quebec; Messrs. Ross, Church, McIsaac and Coffin, from Nova Scotia; Picard, Charles Burpee, Domville, Anglin, and Smith from New Brunswick. So you will see that the return moved for by the hon. gentleman does not at all establish the proposition he has undertaken to establish. It shows beyond all controversy that the Government of that day did not interfere with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in the performance of his duties. What was the position of things at that time? The law did not require simultaneous elections, and yet the Government adopted that principle. They put the Government on an equality with their opponents in the election, and they abided by the decision of public opinion, honestly and fairly obtained without any undue advantage that administrative influence could give them; and the same fairness was exhibited by the Government in the publication of these returns in the *Gazette*. If the hon. gentleman wishes a full and fair report, let him amend his return to include the elections of 1878 as well as those of 1882, brought down in the form in which we have the return respecting the elections of 1886, and then we shall see how two elections under a Reform Administration and two under a Conservative Administration were conducted, and whether any undue or improper influence was used over the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in connection with the gazetted of members. I shall show that that officer flagrantly violated his duty, that he violated his oath of office, and the Government ought to dismiss him for his improper conduct.

Mr. TUPPER. My hon. friend seems to think I brought this motion forward as a *tu quoque*. I said I did not from these facts, which I thought harmless both in 1874 and in 1887, draw any conclusion adverse to the officer under a Reform or under a Liberal-Conservative Government; and I read—and the hon. gentleman repeated to some extent the statement—the same in reference to the numbers returned

Mr. MILLS,

in these different *Gazettes*. So far as the hon. member disagrees with me in that matter, we can be both set right by any hon. gentleman who will look the subject up when these returns are all presented. I based my remarks on the opinion that I thought the hon. gentleman had discovered a mare's nest.

Mr. MITCHELL. I was not present at the beginning of the argument, but I judge from what the hon. member from Bothwell said that he imputed to the mover the desire to set off the misconduct of the previous Administration against that of this Administration, and that the hon. gentleman repudiates the idea of any such attitude being taken by him. As one independent of both Administrations, certainly not favorable to the Administration at the date to which the motion refers, and not particularly friendly to the Administration of the day, I entirely agree with the hon. member for Bothwell that the publications of the returns from the different constituencies are so marked in their character, so very unfair, that the House should demand explanations from the Officer of the Crown whose duty it was to publish these, in order that we may find whether his course was suggested to him or whether it was an accident. If it was, it was certainly a very remarkable one.

Mr. MILLS. It is impossible it was an accident.

Motion agreed to.

ICE BOATS—PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. PERRY moved for:

Return showing the names of all the parties who tendered for carrying the mails to and from the board ice at Cape Traverse, Prince Edward Island; the amount of each tender, and to whom contract given?

He said: In my opinion, and in that of the people of the Island, the ice-boats ought to be kept longer on the route. I remember well this winter, I think it was on the 5th or 6th of April, the *Northern Light* made her first trip from Georgetown to Pictou, and a day or two afterwards boats at the capes were ordered to be put up and the *Northern Light* got caught in the ice. From that day, there were no mails landed on the island for eight days afterwards and the boats were idle. If the management of the service were left to the Agent of Marine and Fisheries there, he would keep the boats going until later, and far more satisfaction would be given. The least one would expect from the Government, in view of the large number of passengers who cross, would be to keep these boats on the route as late as required. Until the Government think well to build the subway that we hear so much about, or a tunnel, or a bridge, I hope they will keep these boats long enough on the route in the spring to carry mails and passengers, until the *Northern Light* or some other steamer will be able to cross daily.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY SUPPLIES.

Mr. JONES moved for:

Return of supplies furnished to the Intercolonial Railway, Halifax and Truro, with names of parties, quantity, and prices paid, stating in each case whether by contract or by private agreement.

He said: I make this motion with the object of obtaining from the Government some explanation with reference to the mode adopted in obtaining supplies for the Intercolonial Railway. It amounts to a very large sum in the Lower Provinces, and I have been informed that the same mode is followed there which was followed under the Administration some few years ago, and which then resulted in a very unsatisfactory agitation, as hon. gentlemen on that side will remember. It would appear from all the reports in circulation, that certain parties have the supplying of the road pretty much on their own terms; at least