

ceedingly that the Minister of Justice has taken the position he has. He would have occupied a high place in the estimation of the people of this country if he could have swept to one side the legal technicalities that he has raised, and taken that manly stand which would be approved of by the country if not by the House, and say that in all justice and fair play the man who was elected to represent Queen's county honestly and properly ought to have his name inserted in place of that of the man who is usurping the position.

Mr. GILLMOR. I am sure the House will bear with me for a few minutes. I do not rise for the purpose of arguing the question at all, but, being a friend of Mr. King, having been associated with him for some time here, coming from the same Province, I feel I ought to show myself on the side of justice and fair play. I think Mr. King will expect me, as an old acquaintance and political friend, to at least express my desire that justice should be done him. I am disappointed at the result that is likely to follow this discussion. I never, since the return of Mr. Baird was made for this House, believed this Parliament would allow Mr. Baird, who had the minority of votes, to keep his seat. I differed on that point with my friends around me, for I never, until now, fully believed that a majority of this House would commit such an act of injustice towards Mr. King as they appear about to commit. Judging from the general opinion expressed throughout the Dominion, in the press and in conversations everywhere, both of Liberals and Conservatives, that the case was a plain one and that Mr. Baird could be unseated, I felt satisfied that there was sufficient conscientiousness in the House to do Mr. King justice. I felt satisfied when, on the first introduction of this subject, the right hon. the First Minister got up and cautioned hon. gentlemen on this side not to introduce party feeling into the discussion, that the leader of the Government was about to do the fair thing and that Mr. King would be given his seat. To-day, however, appearances have somewhat changed. Hon. gentlemen opposite who, at the opening of the Session, appeared to be in favor of justice and fair play, and who indulged in most severe expressions with regard to the returning officer and all those concerned in this transaction, appear now to have somewhat changed in their views. My experience is that in matters of right first impressions are always correct, and the first impressions of hon. gentlemen opposite appeared to think that injustice had been done, since then they have thought the matter over, their party feeling has become aroused, and they appear inclined to take a different view. What appeared first to be glaringly unjust they now look upon with complaisance.

"Vice is a monster of such frightful mien,
That to be hated needs but to be seen,
But seen too oft, familiar with her face,
They first endure, then pity, then embrace."

Hon. gentlemen opposite have concluded to embrace the monster which they first despised. I am sorry such is the case. I do not want to say a word about the man who accepted the position. I would not like to make him feel worse than he does, if he is capable of feeling at all the position he occupies. I do not want to pour water on a drowned rat. I was reading an American paper yesterday, and, although the case may not be exactly parallel, it speaks of a certain official there who was found guilty of wrong-doing with regard to registration, and who is now in gaol at St. Louis. There was a petition to have him released, and the newspaper thus gives the result :

"WASHINGTON, May 24.—The President to-day denied the application for a pardon in the case of James J. Stanley, who was sentenced 13th April for fraudulent registration and sentenced to 90 days imprisonment in the gaol at St. Louis. The President endorsed the application as follows:—

"Denied. I cannot pardon a crime against the election laws, except it be in a case presenting unusually strong considerations for clemency. I consider such offences the worst of all crimes, and I know of none the punishment of which is more important to the public."

I am satisfied that the crime committed by the returning officer in Queen's county deserves just such treatment as that, and that is the opinion expressed by many of those who are going to vote here to send this case to the courts. I wonder how these gentlemen would like if, after having received a majority of votes, they were not declared elected, and were told to seek redress in the courts of law. Very few gentlemen elected to Parliament feel like going to court to establish their rights to their seats. Mr. King certainly should have a seat here; and I believed until now that the majority of this House would reverse the decision of the returning officer, and do justice to Mr. King. I do not wish to trespass on your time, Sir, by arguing the case. It is plain to every one that the returning officer should have returned the man who has received the majority of votes, and not the other man; and from what I have learned, I am satisfied Parliament has the right to consider this question. With regard to the legal lore displayed by the hon. the Minister of Justice, I must say, that instead of trying to enlighten the House on a question of law, he appeared to endeavor to mystify it, and obscure what, on its face, was plain. I had a suspicion, when I found the long delay to occur in the return, and saw that at last Mr. Baird was returned for the electoral district of Queen's, that the Minister of Justice had given his opinion in reference to that matter, and I am inclined to think so now. However, I must say that I am disappointed, for I thought I saw signs of a willingness to give fair play on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. I thought that on this question they would exercise their honest convictions and listen to the still small voice of conscience. I do not want to charge gentlemen on the other side with a lack of conscience or a lack of conviction. It is enough for me to look out for myself; but I cannot understand it. In fact they admit that the whole thing is wrong, but they say Mr. King should go to the courts. Now, Mr. King has decided not to go to the courts. You all agree that the sitting member ought not to be the sitting member. Mr. King is not going to the courts and you are going to allow a man to sit here who ought not to sit here. That is the result, because Mr. King is not going to the courts for reasons which I suppose he knows. Perhaps he is not able; perhaps he has not the means. I do not wish to detain the House longer, but I thought I ought to say a few words in sympathy with my much respected friend King, who fought his battle nobly, who fought it manfully, and then after he had gained the seat it has been taken away from him by the returning officer.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The hon. member for Elgin stated that, if this was a case that should go to the court under the Controverted Elections Act, he and all hon. gentlemen on that side of the House had nothing to say against it. I understood that to be the proposition, but he said in this case there was nothing to go before a court, that the case was so plain that there could be no two opinions about it. I confess that I was very much of that opinion myself until I looked into the matter. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down said that with him first impressions are always the right ones. I think now that my first impressions were not the right ones. I was of opinion that this was a wrongful act. I am still of the opinion that this is a wrongful act, but I differ from hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to the remedy that should be applied. I think this is a case that should properly go to a court, and there is authority for; it and I think, even from what I have heard fall from the lips of hon. gentlemen in this House, it has been shown that a learned judge in the Province where