

myself and colleagues was not gazetted until the 19th. We find that while the Minister of Inland Revenue was gazetted on the 12th March, the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., was not gazetted till the 2nd April, and the hon. member for Charlotte is in the same position. Again, we find the hon. member for Northumberland not gazetted till 26th March. The local position of the counties does not account for the discrepancy, and unless the returning officers held back the returns—and I do not believe those officers failed to do their duty—they must all have been mailed pretty nearly at the same time and arrived here on or about the same day. Then the question is, by what right were they withheld from the *Gazette*? It is the duty of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, on receipt of the return, immediately to have the member elect gazetted. Every hon. member must feel that we are all mighty glad when the term of probation—as the hon. member for Elgin called it—is over, and the longer it continues the longer we remain in a state of anxiety. For that reason I think it is only fair that the returns should be gazetted as early as possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So far as the hon. member for North Ontario is concerned, for my part I readily accept his statement—as I am bound to do—that he does not owe his return, at any rate, to any corrupt influences. My recollection of the mode in which that gentleman's return was secured is that, like not a few hon. members on that side of the House, he owes his return to a certain Act—facetiously entitled: An Act for the better representation of the people—passed in 1842, under which my constituency disappeared altogether, and many others, represented by members on this side, were altered in a very remarkable way. As for the kindness manifested by the right hon. gentleman towards the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) it speaks for itself, while as to the contention of his friend the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), who does not appear to be able to understand that it is any detriment whatever to members of the Opposition that sixty days should be given to their opponents wherein to collect evidence against their return, as against thirty days, or thereabouts, in the case of favored members on the other side, all I can say is that the argument did not strike me as particularly logical. As I understand the intent of the law, it is this: that there should be thirty days and no more given fairly and equally, during which, if evidence of corruption or improper practices can be obtained against any member, a petition can be presented; and it is not just or right or fair play in any sense of the term that by some hocus-pocus, whether practiced by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery or by partisan returning officers, under any instigation, that members on one side of the House should be subjected to a much longer period of scrutiny than members on the other side. Doubtless, Sir, the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) can give wrinkles not merely to members of the Local Governments, but, I dare say, to members of the Government here, and if it be true as suggested by the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) that he owes his election largely to intelligent American sympathisers who swarmed across the border on his behalf, I have no doubt we shall have an opportunity of deciding how far those worthy persons are entitled to act as agents for a Canadian member of Parliament. As to those *Gazette* returns the matter lies in a nutshell. Here are the facts in brief. On the 5th, 12th and 19th of March you have fifty Conservative members of Parliament from Ontario gazetted and nine members gazetted on the Opposition side. Pure accident, no doubt—a just proportion, no doubt. The other day—I suppose I may be pardoned for mentioning it—the hon. gentleman on the other side did not claim, I think, that he had a majority of more than some twelve or fourteen in Ontario, and I do not think that the proportion of fifty to nine, gazetted in three

Mr. WELDON (St. John).

weeks, entirely corresponds to the majority which even he claims, no matter how obtained. On the other side, for the other three weeks—March 26th and April 2nd and 9th, the result was that twenty-nine Liberal members for Ontario were gazetted against four on the other side, which seems to me a rather extraordinary proportion. If this result has arisen from any act of the officer of the Government here—the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery—this House has abundant right to know and investigate the facts. Practically a very gross unfairness has been committed, as is apparent, I think, to every hon. gentleman in this House. I know perfectly well that it is a very serious injustice that one man should be kept for sixty days or more exposed to the penalties of an election petition, while another should only have thirty days. Why, Sir, my hon. friend who has just left his seat (Mr. Mackenzie) informs me that the return from the returning officer of East York was dated on the 3rd of March. My hon. friend was gazetted on the 9th of April, the return being in on the 3rd of March in the case of Alexander Mackenzie. At the same date was gazetted Mr. Dawson, of Algoma, whose recount, if my memory serves, was closed somewhere about the 2nd of April. At the same time was gazetted Mr. Cargill, of Bruce, who had time to run two elections and get gazetted twice while my hon. friend was being gazetted once. Now, these things may be the result of accident. It may have come to pass by some mysterious fatality these fifty returning officers appointed by the Government in these fifty constituencies were so much more expeditious than the twenty-nine returning officers who returned Liberal members in making their returns. If they did, it is a remarkable coincidence and it sheds some light on the desire of the First Minister to act impartially and to give us the benefit of returning officers who will do justice between man and man. The hon. gentleman declares that it was impossible for his Government to allow these officers to be appointed by hostile bodies. I would like to know if the Government of Quebec, until a recent date, was a hostile body? Was the Government of Manitoba, until a recent date, a hostile body? I do not know whether they are now or not; they are taking issue with the hon. gentleman on some questions. And then he, of all men in the world, declaims in bitter language against the hostility of the Local Government of Ontario. Why was he with his friends the Minister of Marine, the Minister of Interior the late Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Justice, travelling about Ontario in palatial style, from one end to the other, for a period of six months preceding the local elections? What were they doing? Unless I greatly misrecollect his statements, there was hardly an audience he addressed to whom he did not lay down the position, with great emphasis, that the interests of the country were bound up in the defeat of the Mowat Administration; he did his best to put them out, and if he did not succeed the reason was that the Mowat election was conducted under an honest voters' list, without a Gerrymander Act, without being bedeviled by partisan revising officers. If the truth were known it would be found to be this: that the difference between the votes recorded on behalf of my hon. friend here, and those recorded on behalf of the right hon. gentleman, does not represent honestly and fairly the balance of political opinion among the people of Ontario, but that they represent the extent to which, by means of the Gerrymander Act, the Franchise Bill and partisan returning officers, it was possible to disguise and conceal the true sentiments of the people of Canada. Why, Sir, I know of a case myself in which in one single county there was a difference of thirteen or fourteen hundred between the vote on which the election was conducted in Mr. Mowat's case, and the vote under which it was conducted in the Dominion elections; six hundred or seven hundred left off in one case and