

whether in this Parliament or in the Legislature of Ontario, I have this to say, that no man, whether leader of the Government or a follower, ever asked me how I was going to vote before I voted, or ever spoke to me after I voted with regard to my vote or criticised my action. I saw in one of the leading papers that words had passed between me and some of my friends, and that I had left for my constituency with the intention of resigning my seat. There is not a shadow of truth in that or any of the other statements made respecting me in this matter. If any high words passed, it must have been between gentlemen defending and attacking me behind my back. In my presence my actions were never criticised. I do not know how it is among other gentlemen opposite, but I never knew a case on this side, either in this Parliament or in the Ontario House, where a man was brought to task for his vote. I do not think that any man on this side of the House would tolerate—I, for one, would certainly not tolerate—the interference of any man with what I consider my rights in this House. However humble I may be in ability, however inferior I may be to others in the qualities which constitute a useful member of Parliament, on the question of my vote, and as a representative of an important constituency, I consider myself the peer of any man in this House, and I acted in what I believed to be in the best interests of my constituents when I cast my vote. I have made this statement because I think it is just, not only to myself, but to hon. gentlemen around me, to contradict the statement that I have been made to feel any resentment from a ministerial source or from my colleagues. I was not aware of any such feeling until I saw it stated in the public print. I have fully explained the ground on which I intend to vote, and I regret that I have to take that ground as against those with whom I usually act. I have not the shadow of a doubt about my clear duty in this matter. If I had the shadow of a doubt, in reference to the legal or constitutional ground on which I shall vote to-night, I would give that doubt in favor of the Government of the day of which I am a supporter; but I have no doubt on the question, and firmly believe that we have the right to act in this matter; that it is only a question of expediency, and that, as a question of expediency, we ought to do our duty with a view to the honor and to the prestige of this House. If we expect the country to respect us, we must respect ourselves. What does the honor and credit of this House amount to if we sink in the estimation of the country? If the House is strong in the estimation of the country, it is because in the past great men have been members of it, and the House is sacred to us and looked up to throughout the country owing to the memory of those men. We desire, as far as our humble abilities will permit, to live up to the traditions of this Parliament in the past, and to leave to our successors, untarnished and untainted, the stainless record we have received from the great men who have gone before us.

**Mr. COCKBURN.** I regret very much that I am one of those unfortunate people who are not blessed with that amount of intelligence which enables them at once to see clear as the noon-day sun through the intricacies of this question, which has been debated here for the last two or three days. Consequently, I am compelled to ask for a little information, and I am the more pleased to do it when I see so many gentlemen of the Opposition benches who are eminent and distinguished in law. I am but a layman myself, but, if I am able to judge by the remarkable examination of the gentleman who was brought from New Brunswick and placed at our Bar, there is in the Opposition sufficient legal lore to answer the little conundrum which I wish to place before them. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), whose eloquent address I listened to with the greatest pleasure, confessed, in the midst of his oration, that there was a certain informality in the way in which his deposit was made. It might not be an informality; he might declare

**Mr. PATTERSON (Essex).**

that it was not, but he will agree with me that he said his deposit was made in such a way that many members in this House would consider it was an informality, and such an informality as would vitiate his election.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

**Mr. COCKBURN.** Yes, Sir; that is what he said.

**Mr. DAVIES.** If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will state what I said. I said I had not paid my deposit through the hands of my election agent, not deeming that that was the proper way to do it. I paid it through my own hands; and I said I was satisfied that many other members had done the same thing, and that, if they voted to-night that Mr. King had violated the statute in this respect, they would condemn themselves and would have logically to resign their seats.

**Mr. COCKBURN.** I accept the hon. gentleman's statement, but there are many members who consider that this is an informality, and that, if it were strictly regarded, it would vitiate the election of the hon. gentleman. I therefore put this question to him. If he is prepared to decide questions of this kind by the brute majority of this House, he is put in this position: that I can rise and propose that he be expelled from the House in consequence of the informalities by which he obtained his seat. Is he prepared to leave a question of this kind to a majority of the House, or does he not consider that the House acted wisely in leaving the decision of these questions to the judiciary? I am not a lawyer; I am a simple-minded layman; I have no legal lore; but I put that question to the hon. gentleman, and I have that confidence in his honesty, in his integrity, and in his uprightness, and I know his goodness of nature, that I think he will try and answer the little conundrum to the best of his ability.

**Mr. CASEY.** The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has confessed that he has been unable to see this question as clear as noon-day. Perhaps he has illustrated the reason why he is unable to see into this question clear of all mists by showing that he has totally misunderstood the great question which is before the House by the conundrum which, in his humorous way, he has proposed to my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). He says that my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island admitted having paid his deposit in a way which some hon. members consider an informality. I do not know whether he can see that there is any difference or not, but he asks: would my hon. friend be willing to submit the question of such informality to the brute majority, as he playfully calls those on that side of the House. This shows an amount of humor and of wit which is quite refreshing in the House at this time of night, but it shows also, on the part of the hon. gentleman, an utter lack of comprehension of the question at issue, because no one has ever proposed for a moment from this side of the House that it would be advisable to submit a purely technical question of law such as that to which he has referred to the brute majority, or to the brute minority, or to a committee of this House. Our contention has been that legal questions of this kind ought not to be decided by the majority of this House, and I quite agree with those gentlemen who have spent a great deal of time in order to convince us of what we admit already, that it would be very unwise and very unsafe to leave to the decision of the House such legal questions as are involved in the making of deposits, the marking of ballots and other matters of that kind. That is not what we are asking. My hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Aymot) put in a very clear way the problem which is now before the House. He says it is the right and the duty of the House to see that none but members of Parliament sit here. Who is a member of Parliament? A member of Parliament is a man who has been elected by the majority