

was lost on division, the vote standing 36 to 26. A number of private bills were disposed of, and some public and Government bills advanced a stage. A session of the House will be held tomorrow morning (Saturday).

#### The Filing of Protests.

Hon. Mr. Hardy introduced a bill to amend the controverted elections act. One of the most important provisions deals with the question of protests. The complaint in the past has been that protests have been made by irresponsible persons who could not be brought to task for preferring baseless charges. The proposition in this bill is that protests must be signed by four persons, or by the defeated candidate.

#### The Paris Exposition.

It is expected that the supplementary estimates will contain a reasonable sum to enable Ontario to be represented at the Paris Exposition.

#### Railway Subsidies.

The Government will submit resolutions granting aid to a number of railways on Tuesday. It is probable that a subsidy to the projected railway to Missanabie and a further subsidy to the Ontario & Rainy River Railway will be voted.

#### Officials and Elections.

Mr. Tucker moved the second reading of a bill prohibiting the active engaging of officials in elections, under pain of a fine of \$200, forfeiture of position and disqualification for four years.

Hon. Mr. Hardy pointed out that the House had already put itself on record against the active partisanship by officials. The question involved in this bill was one of policy; it was not a question to be penalized. It was difficult to define what taking an active part in elections was, and how far an official might go. A man might attend a public meeting. Was that to be considered active interference in elections? He might shake hands with the candidate or hurrah at a meeting. Under the hon. gentleman's bill he would be liable to a penalty of \$200. Mr. Hardy wondered why Mr. Tucker did not propose to send the man to jail for doing that. The hon. gentleman wanted to enact an old-fashioned law. He might have rounded the measure off by providing for the thumbscrew, the rack and the bolt. (Ministerial cheers.) It was never the policy of any Government to penalize an officer or make him vacate his place unless he was guilty of action inconsistent with his position. The bill went too far altogether. No large class of Provincial officials had ever been guilty of action such as complained of during the elections or the bye-elections. Since the elections had closed the Opposition had abated the fury of their attack upon officials, but when the campaign was on they did all they could to hold the officials up to scorn and ridicule. The Opposition leader was the foremost in that kind of work, and it was directly intimated by him and others that if the Conservatives triumphed the officials would go. "Boys, pick out your places."

was the motto held up, and Conservatives were told to be ready to fill the positions that would be vacated by officials. It was the most gigantic and the most corrupt form of bribery ever introduced into any country. He would not have wondered if some officials had taken part in the elections as a protest against the direct threats which were made against them by the Opposition.

#### Mr. Whitney's Answer.

Mr. Whitney said that a majority of the public officials in the Province were and had been a brigade acting under the orders of the Attorney-General, and no human being knew it better than

the hon. gentleman himself. As a body the servants of the Government of the Province were reputable men, yet there was a large proportion of them who busied themselves from January to December, day and night, Sundays and week days, working in the interests of the Ontario Government. The Government was entitled to full credit for the resolution referred to, which was one of the broadest farces ever brought to the attention of the Legislature. The public servant who did his duty in Ontario had nothing to fear from the Conservative party. Had he framed the bill himself he would not perhaps have framed it in the same way, and while he felt sorry at the need of such a drastic measure, he felt it his duty to support the bill, which would be the first step to put a stop to the monstrous condition of affairs in Ontario with regard to interference in elections by Government officials.

Hon. Mr. Garrow was not aware that the Opposition had brought a single charge against any official for interference in elections. He remembered at the time the resolution was discussed that the Attorney-General was asked if the motion would be enforced. Mr. Hardy's reply was that a charge brought against any official would be investigated, and if the charge were substantiated the offender would be dismissed. Until some action of that kind had been taken, Mr. Garrow submitted, there was sufficient law on the subject. If the Government did not deal with any specific cases that were brought to their notice he would have something to say upon the subject, and see if there was any cause for complaint.

Mr. Marter said Mr. Garrow must have considered there was need for action, otherwise he would not have moved his resolution against partisan officials. The resolution was good enough in its way, but it did not go far enough.

Mr. Stratton said that in making the general charges hon. gentlemen should give particulars—name the officials who had taken active part in the elections. They would mention Mr. McDonald and Mr. Stubbs, but these gentlemen were not now in the employ of the Government.

Mr. Miscampbell—Will they be again?

Mr. Stratton—Why should they not? Continuing, he wondered why hon. gentlemen should talk so loudly of the actions of Government employees when they considered for how long Liberals had had to contend with a vast army of active officials in the employ of the Conservative Administration.