

concerning the reasons why the protest proceedings were stayed. Our contemporary's assertions that "It has interviewed leading Liberals, who say no agreement was made," and "We are assured by gentlemen who are in a position to know, that there never was any agreement between Messrs. J. R. McPhail, T. O. Davis and the Laurier Government." is silly in the extreme.

The paper asserts that those gentlemen have been kept in the dark, and re-asserts all its previous statements, which the affidavit supports.

Now, Mr. Speaker, very great misconduct on the part of the Government is charged by this newspaper, supported by this agreement and by the affidavit of those who have seen this agreement; and hon. gentlemen may be perfectly assured of this, that we have come to a time in this country when you cannot burk or bamboozle public opinion for any length of time. It is futile to say, "Oh, we will not regard this, because an hon. member does not rise in his place and move to have the matter referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections." Why, Sir, who is the first man who should rise in this House and move to have the matter referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections? The Prime Minister himself should be the first man to ask for an inquiry, in order that his own Government, if innocent, should have an opportunity of clearing its skirts. But I know—because I had the means of observing what took place—that the gentlemen mentioned here came to Ottawa and had their interviews here; it was arranged in Ottawa that this protest should be dropped; and though they hurried back to Prince Albert, they must have worked by telegraph, because by the time they arrived there, the motion had already been made to take the protest off the files, and the \$1,000 deposit had been withdrawn.

Sir, it is for the honour of the country that I should bring this matter forward; and I find, on looking at May and at Bourinot—and if necessary I could fortify myself with precedents from our own "Hansard"—that the course I have taken is the parliamentary course as well as the course of common sense, and the proper course in the interest of the dignity of this Parliament and of the good government of this country. I move, seconded by Mr. Taylor, the adjournment of the House.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to go into any very long details in connection with this matter. I may say, in the first place, that I did not know that it was going to be brought up by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). I had no intimation of his intention until I met the hon. gentleman in the corridor to-day, when he told me that he was going to bring it up. I told him I was unwell, and did not intend to be in the House to-day. The hon. gentleman seems to be greatly bothered about

Mr. DAVIN.

protests; however, I do not think I should be held responsible for all the newspaper gossip in the country. I have seen this newspaper notice that he has been quoting from, but I do not see that I should be held responsible for anything of that kind. The facts of the case are these: There was a protest against my election; I had a summons to have the preliminary objections disposed of; and Mr. McPhail, the petitioner, was notified. The case came up before Judge McGuire, a judge of the Supreme Court of the North-west Territories, and it was thrown out for want of evidence. These are all the facts of the matter. I had the pleasure, shortly afterwards of reading a letter which the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) sent in connection with this matter to a gentleman named Mr. Gunn, who showed it to me. The hon. member, I believe, offered to furnish the necessary money to proceed with the protest. I suppose the hon. gentleman, having a protest against his own election, would like to have some way of sawing-off. I have no doubt that is what is the matter with him. The gentleman to whom the letter was sent would take no action in the way proposed. I know nothing more about the matter than that. I was not present when the hon. gentleman brought it up to-day, and I only heard a few of his last remarks. If I had been notified, I might have gone more fully into it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I trust that this motion will not be put until the Government take the opportunity of giving some answer to the very grave statement that has been put before this House. I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, and the attention of this House to the fact that the hon. gentleman who sits in this House as the representative of the constituency referred to has taken his seat without venturing to challenge the statement that he is not the representative in this House of that constituency.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, the statement has been made, and an affidavit has been read, of parties who, I am informed, are respectable residents of that district, and who swear that they have seen statements made by which that hon. gentleman has surrendered his position as a representative of this House, and confided the duties and responsibilities—

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order. The hon. leader of the Opposition is taking exactly the line for which you, Mr. Speaker, ruled the hon. member for Assiniboia out of order. He is declaring that the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) is not the member for Saskatchewan, but has surrendered his seat in the House by the course of action he has taken. I think these