

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Would you not add the word correspondence? From a conversation I had with Mr. Vankoughnet, I find that the Department claim that they have the authority of Joseph Brant, acting as the accredited agent of the Indians, for the substitution of the Simcoe deed for the other; and, if that is in existence, it should be brought down with all documents of that kind.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The motion, as I understand, is to be a broad one.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, in the widest sense. Motion, as amended, agreed to.

PURCHASE OF THE NORTH SHORE RAILROAD.

Mr. GIGAULT, in the absence of Mr. AMYOT, moved for:

Copies of the bargains, agreements or contracts made between the Government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, respecting the purchase of the North Shore Railroad between Montreal and Quebec, or between St. Martin's and Quebec; and also for copies of the contracts between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Railway Company for the purchase or transfer of the said portion of the North Shore Railway.

Mr. POPE. Those papers were all laid on the Table of the House last year, I believe; but if there are any which were not, there is no objection to bringing them down.

Motion amended by inserting after the word "copies" the words "all papers not already brought down."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

RETURNS OF GENERAL ELECTIONS OF 1874.

Mr. TUPPER moved for:

Return showing as to each electoral district the date of the return made to the writ by the returning officer in each electoral district after the General Elections of 1874, the date at which such return reached the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, the date at which such return was gazetted, and all correspondence between himself and the returning officer in reference to the returns.

He said: I wish to explain to the House my object for making this motion, which will be somewhat similar in its result to the motion made a short time ago in reference to the election returns of the last election. It will be recollected that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) laid considerable stress on the fact that, in the returns after the last general election, he found that members on one side of the House seemed to be gazetted exclusively in the first *Gazettes* after the election, and he took the trouble to explain to the House the result of an investigation he had made into those returns. He said:

"But we know right well when we find that, in the first instance, members on that side of the House are exclusively gazetted, and members on this side of the House are excluded from the *Gazette*, that it is done for a purpose, and it is the duty of this House to enquire into the irregularities of the proceedings in this particular."

Now, I took the trouble to look up the returns of the election run under the Reform Government of this country—the only election of that kind which had ever been conducted, both before and after, under the auspices of a Reform Government in Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What about 1878?

Mr. TUPPER. I said both before and after, but in the election of 1878 the Reform Government ceased to exist by the time the returns were in.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. TUPPER. Virtually and constitutionally it ceased to exist.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No, not constitutionally.

Mr. TUPPER. However, be that as it may, in explaining the object I have in view it is simply necessary to draw attention to what happened in that particular year, in the same line of argument as that adopted by the hon. member for Bothwell. He found that on the 5th of March, 1887, seven Tories and one Liberal were gazetted. Now, I find that on the 31st of January, 1874, there were gazetted ten Grits and one Conservative. Then, my hon. friend found that on the 12th of March, 1887, twenty-eight Tories and five Reformers were gazetted. I find that on 7th February, 1874, twenty-three Grits and twelve Conservatives were gazetted. Then, I find that the hon. gentleman laid stress on the fact that, on the 19th of March, 1887, fourteen Tories and three Reformers were gazetted, while I find that on the 28th of February, 1874, twenty-eight Grits and eleven Conservatives were gazetted, so that if my hon. friend looks at all the returns he will find that he can find no good argument upon such a coincidence. I make no charge against the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in connection with the performance of his duties in 1874; but I think the returns on that occasion will show that no good charge can be made against that officer in connection with the performance of his duties in the last election. It will be found that prominent names of Reformers reached the *Gazette*, and were published before those of Conservatives at that time. For instance, there were no less than seven batches of returns after that election made by the Clerk, and published in the *Gazette*. Those returns continued from early in February, through the month of March, and extended over a period of eight or nine weeks. I find the names of nearly all the prominent Liberals in the first two *Gazettes*—the names, for instance, if I may be excused for mentioning them, of the leader of the Government of that day, Mr. Mackenzie, Sir Richard Cartwright, Mr. Ross, Mr. Paterson, Mr. Charlton, and other leading members of the party. I think that fact weakens considerably that portion of my hon. friend's argument. It is quite true, in 1874 the elections were not by law required to be held simultaneously; and whatever difference that may make, I do not think it has much bearing on this point. But, as the Reform party had previously claimed that in justice and right those elections should be held simultaneously, I find in the *Toronto Globe* the boast was made that Mr. Mackenzie had, so far as possible, carried out the view he had advocated while in Opposition and had, on the first opportunity, though not required by the law, so arranged the elections as to have them, as far as possible, held simultaneously. In Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick, the nomination day was on the 22nd of January, and polling day on the 29th of January; and in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island nomination day and polling day were respectively two days later. Therefore, I think the weakness of my hon. friend's argument is tolerably well demonstrated by a reference to the returns about which he knows so much.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have no intention of renewing the discussion of the subject I brought before the House a few days ago. I have a motion on the paper, which will come up to-morrow, when I think I shall be able to show to the House that the views I have expressed already, in condemnation of the conduct of this officer, are amply justified by the returns brought down. The hon. gentleman has moved for a return in connection with the election of 1874. That return will not sustain the proposition he has undertaken to establish. If the conduct of the former Government were as objectionable as the hon. gentleman would seek to have the House believe, I altogether repudiate the notion that a wrong done by one Administration, if a wrong has been done, is any justification for a course being persisted in that interferes with the liberties of the people at this hour. If that