

has submitted a free Parliament. I am bound to accept the statement of hon. gentlemen sitting behind him who say that they vote according to their consciences, according to their judgment. It is right to concede that to them, and to accept their statements as they have given them, and I do accept them. But, Sir, we all know the position in which this House stands; we know that the right hon. gentleman assumes and exercises the power of dictating to this House, and of leading and influencing the men who sit behind him and have confidence in him. I say that in the long course of thirty-two years of parliamentary life that I have experienced, I have never witnessed an act so humiliating—an act which so degrades Parliament—which so subordinates the free interests and the free voice of the electors, as the decision which has just been arrived at of sustaining a man in his seat returned under such circumstances and having a minority of votes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. MITCHELL. You will get the question when I am ready. Subordinates them to the will of a single man such as this vote that he has led, that he has dictated, that he has forced upon this House. Sir, when the history of this country is written, the right hon. gentleman's name will be associated with this vote as an act—I will not designate it, because parliamentary rules prevent me from designating it by the name by which I think it is entitled to be named; but were I outside this House, and speaking of it, I would say: that act of the right hon. gentleman, the First Minister, which induced this House to pronounce as it has pronounced to-night, is an act of infamy.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I protest against the insult which the hon. member for Northumberland has offered to those members who have voted with the Government on this question. If we have been induced to vote to-day as we have done, it is due to the law that was enacted by the Liberal party, and not by the Government. It has been decided by Parliament that all contested elections should be decided by the tribunals. I do not know that we should undertake to create a precedent to please either the member for Northumberland or any hon. member on the left.

Mr. Fiset. He has sold himself.

Mr. GUILBAULT. That is not true. That is blackguardly.

Mr. DESJARDINS. What is that you say?

Mr. GUILBAULT. It is not true. He has lied.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I want the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Fiset) to repeat what he has just said when I was speaking. If the hon. member does not dare to repeat what he said, it is an act—well, I do not know how to characterise it, but I would do so outside of the House. I say, Sir, that instead of being an act of infamy, as the hon. member for Northumberland characterised our vote, it is an act of independence. I do not care, I have been accustomed to the insults—

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down, sit down.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to a question of order. The question is this: The hon. member from Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) has imputed to me a statement alleging that he and hon. members who had voted with him, had committed an act of infamy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. So you did.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did nothing of the kind. What I said was this: that I was bound to accept the statement of hon. gentlemen that they had voted according to their consciences, and I did accept it, and I said that I placed the responsibility at the door of the right hon. gentleman who

led this House, and that history would record in the future that he was responsible for this act.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman was guilty of a bad example, which I am sorry should have been set by an old member of Parliament.

Mr. MULOCK. As I understand the hon. member for Northumberland is not allowed to speak at this stage, I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. To the Chair I will always bow with that respect and submission which are due to the head of an honorable body like this. But, Sir, I would like to ask wherein have I been out of order? I did not say that the hon. gentleman, the member for Hochelaga, who is so ready to take offence, on this occasion was guilty of an act of infamy. I will not say that he has taken this opportunity to take advantage of a remark which I made—not applied to him nor to any other hon. gentleman who supports the Government, but my remarks were applied to the right hon. gentleman who controls this House. The hon. gentleman may say what he likes about his independence. He may, as he says, be as independent as the member for Northumberland. He may be, Sir, but his conduct has not shown it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman not to repeat the words which he has been using. I think that I was too indulgent at first in allowing them to pass.

Mr. MITCHELL. What words does the Speaker refer to?

Mr. SPEAKER. No hon. member in this House has a right to qualify a vote as an infamy.

An hon. MEMBER. He did not.

Mr. MITCHELL. I appeal now to this House who heard me—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am in order. I will speak my sentiments. I would like to put the hon. Speaker right in relation to this matter. I did not apply the word "infamy" to any individual. I appeal to the memory of hon. gentlemen in this matter. I said I would not designate from my place in the House the act of the right hon. gentleman as it deserved: but, I said, if I were outside of the House I would do so. I would like to know wherein I am out of order in that particular. I am strictly in order, and I would call upon the Speaker to withdraw the statement he has made, that I am out of order.

Mr. DESJARDINS. It is not permitted to insult a man who has voted and is not afraid of the consequences. But an hon. member says that he will repeat outside what he cannot state here. That is an insinuation that cannot be borne.

Some hon. MEMBERS. You said that yourself.

Mr. MITCHELL. You said it; I did not. I said were I outside the House I would speak of it in that way.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The law as laid down in the Controverted Elections Act provides that we must have recourse to the courts, and I think they are the proper tribunals to which we must refer these questions, especially when we see such a burst of passion as we have just witnessed in the judging of this case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken was good enough to state that he was only following the precedent set by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. It is, I believe, quite true that the Liberal party did move to refer these cases of controverted elections from the very dubious tribunal which used to try them to the courts of law. But it is not true, the hon. gentleman was gravely misinformed, if he supposes