

of ridicule, the butts of the press of the whole Dominion. Now, if the Tory slogan that the hon. gentleman mentioned had gone forth against him in this election campaign, there was a no less forcible slogan which went forth against me in my election. I had a very ticklish question to deal with, and the slogan against me at one time was not the same as the slogan at another time. I had to fight the Riel matter, and that was introduced by the party of the hon. members from the Opposition. If the Riel matter had been left out of my county, I would have had a lesser fight, but that was introduced by whom? By the party of the hon. the leader of the Opposition. It was introduced there, but it had little effect, for the effect which it was thought would be produced in the front of the county, had its counter effect in the rear. I will not mention it further. The hon. the leader of the Opposition said that the slogan had gone forth, and that all sorts of cries had gone out,—

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to order. I have not interrupted the hon. gentleman as a new member when he violated your rule laid down a short time ago, when you declined to permit particulars in regard to returning officers to be stated, which I presume will apply to the good conduct of returning officers as well as to their bad conduct; nor did I interrupt him when he proceeded, contrary to order, to refer to a former debate in terms which could only be excused on the ground of his ignorance of parliamentary procedure; but when he misrepresents my observations I think I should rise to order, and call your attention to his remarks, and ask you to restrain him, unless I am allowed the opportunity to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman from Argenteuil will remember that it is not allowed, according to our rules in this House, to refer to a debate which has taken place on another motion which has already been tried, and I shall ask him not to refer to any of these debates which are now closed.

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil). I am very happy indeed to be corrected. I supposed when I got up that I would be corrected two or three times before I took my seat. I am very fortunate indeed to have been corrected only once. I am satisfied that the conduct of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House in this matter of bringing these election returns and the returning officers and their conduct before the bar of the House will not do them any good. It will fasten more strongly to this party many members who might be vacillating. Why? Because their question is so imbecile. It is an impossibility to find gentlemen on either side of politics that are impartial. Whom shall we appoint as returning officers? Shall we appoint men who are without an opinion of their own? Would they be fit men to put in a position of that kind, men who are not capable of taking one side or the other? I say no. We cannot find such men in the Dominion. They must be either Conservatives or Reformers. Would the party I belong to be guilty of such an act of suicide as to choose men to be returning officers who would be known to be favorable to hon. gentlemen opposite? I thank the House for having so patiently listened to my first speech here, when I have had the privilege of taking my first bath in Dominion politics.

Mr. DALY. Perhaps the House will permit me to make some observations in reply to one hon. gentleman who has referred to the question of certificates used in Selkirk. I was not aware, owing to the fact of the time having elapsed last Tuesday within which my election could be contested, that there was anything against me, or that anything had been done by myself or my agent, that would void my election; there is not the slightest doubt in the world that a petition would have been filed before last Tuesday if it could

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil).

have been done. In reference to certificates, I can tell the hon. gentleman that at a place called Deloraine, in my district, where there was a majority of twenty-four against me, I was very much surprised because my committee told me there were only likely to be a majority of two. After the election I ascertained that the reason why I had a majority of twenty-four against me was, that my opponent had voted twenty-two persons at this poll upon certificates given to him by the returning officer; so that if votes were cast for me on certificates, similar votes were also cast for my opponent. But I understand from whom the hon. gentleman received his information upon this question, because my opponent has been in the city during these past few days; and although he had from the 12th of March, when I was gazetted, up to the 5th of April, when I left the city of Brandon, to petition against my election, he did not do so; but when he came here he apparently consulted with the leader of the Opposition and hon. gentlemen opposite, and he, no doubt, received some new light upon the subject. But, unfortunately for the leader of the Opposition, and unfortunately for my opponent, the time had elapsed, he was two days too late to file the petition. I have not the slightest doubt that he received new light from the leader of the Opposition, and in consequence I am pretty sure they would like to file a petition against me. Now, in reference to returning officers in the Province of Manitoba, I may state that the returning officer for the city of Winnipeg is the registrar for the county of Selkirk, not the electoral district of Selkirk, which I represent; and the returning officer for Lisgar was the registrar of one of the counties comprised within the limits of the electoral district of Lisgar; and I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite will enquire as to whether the election of the hon. member for Lisgar was carried improperly or not, seeing that he was elected by acclamation. The gentleman who acted as returning officer for Provencher was the clerk of the court, and, at the same time, he was a dyed-in-the-wool Grit. Now, the only electoral district, out of five in Manitoba, where that officer was not an officer of the court or registrar, was the district of Selkirk. In Marquette the returning officer was a sheriff of the central judicial district of Manitoba; so that out of the whole five, with the exception of the district I represent, these four gentlemen were officers of the court—one sheriff, two registrars and one clerk of the court. The returning officer in Selkirk was a gentleman who, I am sure, acted most impartially and discharged his duties well, because, if he had not done so, there is no doubt that a petition would have been filed against me before the 12th of this month.

Mr. WATSON. As my constituency has been mentioned by the last speaker, I will take the occasion of saying that I think it very unfortunate that the instructions given to the returning officers should have led to so much trouble. In my county, previous to the nomination and afterwards, the returning officer informed me that he would allow no voters to record their votes on certificate, except two at each poll. That was his interpretation of the Act, and I believe it was correct. But the day before the election, on returning to Portage la Prairie, the returning officer decided that he must do otherwise. The member for Lisgar captured an army of sixty-six certified voters who recorded their votes against me in the town of Portage la Prairie on certificates, as I believe, contrary to law, and contrary to the provision that only two certified voters are entitled to vote at each poll. There are five polling districts in that town, and sixty-six voters outside the town recorded their votes. I have no particular fault to find with that officer in the position he occupies. I know that it was his intention to carry out that election honorably and fairly, but he told me himself that such a pressure was brought to bear upon him by supporters of the Government that he