

make it impossi-
 w in relation to
 ition to the oppor-
 for the use of il-
 carrying the elec-
 her reason which
 ed the hon. gen-
 this: they found
 the writ con-
 the time when
 ax, when every
 in Halifax who
 were eagerly
 ng to secure the
 of being the
 and the mer-
 ing with this
 at if the hon.
 lence of the
 ving been used
 that he will
 tements as a
 s, with relation
 t every person
 epest interest

about the case
 Northumber-

t know what
 member for
 e with it.

ow me to
 ell the hon.
 do with it.
 country of
 ember for
 is resigna-
 it to be
 ister, with
 the names
 sailed in
 rified the
 with his
 ry. This
 layed my
 layed it
 e for it;
 is House,
 orts the
 ent who
 late as
 ould be
 was so
 o stake
 n on it,
 tleman

MR. TUPPER: I consider the allu-
 sion of the hon. the Minister of the
 Interior to the case of the hon. mem-
 ber for Northumberland unfortunate
 for himself, for the case of the hon.
 member for Northumberland forms a
 bright contrast with the case to which
 I have referred. Only a technical
 difficulty arose, and the hon. gentle-
 man, finding this technical difficulty,
 naturally withheld his resignation
 until he found that the hon. the First
 Minister was not going to discharge
 his duty to the House and the country
 by dissolving it and making an appeal
 to the people. The hon. gentleman
 (Mr. Mitchell) then threw himself
 into the hands of his constituents, and
 with what result? Why, all the hon.
 gentleman had to show was his record
 of straightforward and uncompromis-
 ing hostility to the hon. gentlemen
 opposite to be sent back here by accla-
 mation by one of the finest counties to
 be found in the whole Province of
 New Brunswick. When the hon. the
 Premier was seeking to help the cause
 of his struggling candidates, when his
 Minister of Militia was floundering in
 the deep, when he was despatching all
 the telegrams he could send, and exer-
 cising all the official interference
 which he could use in that election
 for the purpose of bolstering up his
 cause, when he (Mr. Jones) was strug-
 gling to keep the surging waters from
 submerging him altogether, where
 was the hon. member for Northum-
 berland? Why, he was floating on the
 crest of a triumphant popular wave
 that sends him here to vindicate the
 interests of the country in this House.
 All the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mitchell)
 had to do was to place himself in the
 hands of his electors, and he had
 nothing to fear. The hon. gentleman
 (Mr. Jones), in his card of thanks to
 the electors, says that his election was
 a Free-trade triumph, and this, Sir, in a
 constituency where in 1874 he had a
 majority of 2,147, a strictly party
 majority.

MR. JONES: Oh!

MR. TUPPER: Does the hon. gentle-
 man mean to say that he did not ex-
 pect to have that majority?

MR. JONES: I might have thought
 I would be likely to have more.

MR. TUPPER: Does the hon. gentle-
 man mean to say that after the coal-
 ition with Mr. Hill, and with the addi-
 tional support obtained from the
 leaders of the Conservative party there,
 through the means to which I have
 referred, and the use of the power of
 the Crown in his favour, that majority
 was one on which he could not rely,
 and that he did not expect to have it
 at this election? I pause for a reply.

MR. JONES: Mr. Hill was not with
 me.

MR. TUPPER: Mr. Hill was the
 ally of this Government, and can the
 hon. gentlemen opposite say that there
 was no alliance when the spectacle
 was there presented of having their
 Minister's battle fought all over the
 country by the Premier of Nova
 Scotia.

MR. JONES: But in 1874?

MR. TUPPER: In 1874, Mr. Hill
 was with the hon. gentleman, and in
 1874, Mr. Hill's adhesion to the cause
 of hon. gentlemen opposite, and his
 withdrawal from the Conservative
 party in connection with other parties,
 changed the majority of the hon.
 gentleman (Mr. Jones). That Hill-
 Jones alliance gave him the majority
 of 2,147. But if this was not the case
 —if Mr. Hill joined the ranks of hon.
 gentlemen opposite subsequently, then
 the case became a great deal stronger,
 because the hon. gentleman ought
 then to have had a much larger
 majority with Mr. Hill's support than
 he otherwise would have had. The
 hon. gentleman seems to question his
 confidence in being entitled to that
 majority. I will give the House evi-
 dence on that point which he will
 scarcely be able to controvert. I hold
 in my hand an article which was pub-
 lished in the *Acadian Recorder*, one of
 the most violent and determined por-
 tions of the press supporting the hon.
 gentleman, and this shows what was
 thought when this statement was
 made on January 18, 1878. It says
 that the battle was fought by the same
 party that fought the battle of 1874,
 and that the hon. gentleman could con-
 fidently expect the same majority now
 as then. It states:—

"In 1874, when, as we pointed out last
 evening, the same gang as are now fooling