

gave an analysis of the votes in each of the eight constituencies in question, showing that the constable vote even if counted as entirely in favor of the Government would not have affected the elections. His own riding of South Norfolk had a record for giving small majorities. On July 1, 1867, the first member sent to this Legislature was elected by a majority of 18. Mr. Charlton's predecessor, who sat on the Conservative side, was elected in 1879 by a majority of 29, and in 1883 by 20. Mr. Charlton first defeated him by a majority of 65, then of 97, and then his predecessor quit the field. Four years ago, owing to a combination of elements working against him, Mr. Charlton said, his majority was cut down to 21, and on March 1 last it was 34. "But I may tell my honorable friends, opposite," Mr. Charlton continued, "that their Conservative friends in South Norfolk will concede that I am not only legally but morally and physically entitled to represent that riding, and that is the intention, that is what I am going to do."

Constables' Vote Immaterial.

In South Norfolk the majority was 34, the number of polling booths 27, number of constables appointed 21, number of constables who voted 19, number of constables who were Liberals 12, number of constables who were Conservatives 7; Liberal majority of constables' votes not counted 29; majority with constables' vote not counted if all constables had voted Liberal 15. One constable did not vote, and another had no vote, while seven who did vote were pronounced Conservatives.

In Lennox, the majority was 43, polling booths 23, constables 11, majority without constables' vote, assuming that all voted Liberal, 32, and in any case the seat is not asked for by the other candidate.

In East Lambton the majority was 40, polling sub-divisions 45, constables appointed 23, of whom 19 were Liberals and 4 pronounced Conservatives; Liberal majority without the constable vote or assuming that all the constables voted for the Liberal candidate, 17.

In Muskoka the majority was 74, polling booths 48; Liberal majority, without the constable vote, assuming that all voted Liberal, 56.

Nipissing—Majority 61, polling sub-divisions 43, presuming one at each polling place), number of constables who were Liberals 25, Conservatives 18. Liberal majority without constable vote 54, Liberal majority without constable vote, assuming that all constables voted Liberal, 18.

West York—Majority 35, polling booths 40, constables 36, Liberal constables 32, Conservative constables 4. Majority if constable vote not counted, 7.

Of South Perth and West Huron he had nothing to say. Dr. Pyne had grouped four of the other constituencies together and by counting the independent vote as against the Government claimed that the Liberal candidates did not represent the majority of the ridings.

Dr. Pyne rose to correct this statement by saying that his contention was that so many votes were cast for

the Government and so many against it, but the distinction in the correction was evidently too fine for the House to grasp.

The popular and able whip of the Liberal party concluded his convincing speech with some good-natured chaff levelled at the Opposition as to the results of the bye-elections.

Mr. Kidd (Carlton) constantly ran foul of the preceding speakers, and was obliged to correct a misconception of the remarks of Mr. Stratton in respect to the Ottawa precedent, to modify a remark in reference to Mr. Charlton's address, to altogether change a statement credited to the Attorney-General, and finally to stand corrected by Mr. Moscrip when he began to quote that gentleman. Mr. Charlton had spoken of seven of the election constables in his constituency as pronounced Conservatives. "Perhaps you bought them by appointing them constables," said Mr. Kidd.

"One of them was a member of the Conservative Committee and worked against me all the way through," said Mr. Charlton. "He was appointed by the Township Clerk, who was a Conservative. Several Township Clerks were deputies and they appointed Conservative constables."

"Well," admitted Mr. Kidd, "I hardly think the payment of a dollar would pull over as good a man as that."

When Mr. Kidd sat down there were calls for the question, and the vote was taken. The vote was on strict party lines and the amendment moved by Mr. Carscallen was lost by 41 yeas to 47 nays, the Government majority remaining at six. There were two pairs—Messrs. Campbell and Malcolm—on the Government side, being paired with Messrs. Eilber and Jamieson, Conservatives, respectively. Mr. Craig was absent owing to sickness.

Mr. Whitney's Objection.

When Mr. Speaker put the main motion, Mr. Whitney rose and called the attention of the Speaker to rules 16 and 114a, the former of which provides that no member is entitled to vote on any question in which he has a direct pecuniary interest and the vote of any member so interested shall be disallowed. Rule 114a provides that if any question shall arise touching the return or election of any member he is to withdraw while the matter is under debate. Continuing, Mr. Whitney said:—Mr. Speaker, certain petitions were filed some days ago referring to this matter, and, in order that no objections can be made to the point of order which I have attempted to raise, I now desire to lay on the table of this House certain certified copies of the petitions fyled in the election courts in the cases in which petitions were fyled. These petitions which I now have here are verified by affidavits which I will read. He then read the affidavits, setting forth that the petitions had been fyled in West York, Nipissing, East Lambton, South Norfolk, Lennox, Muskoka, West Huron, South Perth. Continuing, Mr. Whitney said that if these facts show that the sitting member in each of these cases must have a direct pecuniary interest in the results of each case it must be possible to enforce or apply the rule of