

the purity of the party, that our object is to do right, and to maintain the political morality of this country. (Ministerial applause.)

Will the Opposition Co-operate ?

"I am glad my hon. friend the member for North Toronto (Mr. Marter) says 'We will join hands.' His assistance will be useful. I am confident that honest men from all over the country will join us in endeavoring to so improve the law as to render it more and more difficult for corrupt practices to prevail, and perhaps render it more easy to punish the offenders. I repeat what I said at Whitby. I believe in the political as well as the moral integrity of this country, and I shall be disappointed in our efforts to promote the political morality of this country if I do not find active co-operation from a great many of the hon. gentlemen opposite." (Ministerial cheers.)

Continuing, Mr. Ross referred to Mr. Whitney's Arnprior speech, in which he declared the commission to be a farce. Mr. Whitney interrupted to say he had declared the report inaccurate. Mr. Ross accepted his denial.

Government Did Its Part.

Mr. Whitney had complained that the Attorney-General did not institute proceedings with regard to the corrupt practices. No sooner were they installed and settled in office than they at once proceeded against the persons charged with corrupt practices, beginning in South Ontario. It was no fault of the Judges nor of themselves that no further prosecutions had been made. There were other prosecutions to be made. The Attorney-General's Department was acting as it never acted in an election prosecution before. It was the first time in the history of the country that the intervention of the department had led to prosecution for corrupt practices. Nineteen persons were convicted and sentenced to penalties. More would be taken in their turn, which would show the Government were disposed to enforce the law. He declared that the hon. gentlemen opposite were equally to blame for their non-activity in proceeding against those accused of corruption. Why did they not proceed against the Conservatives in South Ontario? (Cheers.) If Mr. Whitney thought Mr. Cummings guilty, why did he not prosecute him himself? Was he exempted from the duties and the responsibilities of citizenship? The Government were not seized of his guilt, they had no Judge's report to that effect. They could not act on newspaper reports, nor until the Judge's report was laid before the House. (Applause.) Mr. Ross explained the shortage of ballots at the polling booth in East Middlesex as due to the municipal authorities putting a larger number of voters than usual on the list for that subdivision, a circumstance the Government had nothing to do with. There was nothing to show that any evil resulted from it. Mr. Whitney magnified a single speck on the escutcheon of the Liberal party into a mountain. If he were as sincere in purging the body politic of corruption there would be no electoral immorality. (Ministerial cheers.)

Mr. Ross then pointed out that, while the Opposition had denounced a man in West Elgin who was alleged to have corrupted 100 voters, they had no condemnation for the "brawling brood of bribers" who came within the sacred precincts of the Legislature and endeavored to corrupt members of the House. (Ministerial applause.) Mr. Whitney clamored for the appointment of a commission, and when one was appointed he took the ground that it was a farce. It was difficult to satisfy the leader of the Opposition. The Government were not to be stampeded into doing their duty, but had gone about the matter just as soon as they were able. Mr. Ross drew attention to the reputed refusal of the Conservative Executive in West Elgin to testify before the commission, and asked why they did not take advantage of the

election trial in June last, when there were 250 charges presented against Mr. Macnish, and the whole machinery of the election law was available for the purposes of investigation? As to the burning of the ballots, if the Opposition had evidence upon the matter why did they not bring it before the commission.

An Insane Act.

Mr. Carscallen professed to believe that the ballots had been deliberately burned. If the Opposition had evidence that such had been done, let them produce it. All the evidence was to the contrary. What motive could there be for such a thing? Leaving out the question of morality, no person who had any judgment would, in the interest of any party or Government, have suggested such a thing as the burning of ballots. Mr. Ross then pointed out that there had been numerous opportunities for disclosing the fact that the ballots had disappeared if the Opposition had only taken advantage of them.

The news of the burning of the ballots had been published months ago, and he had been prepared to make a statement on the matter during the bye-election campaign had he been asked to do so. There was no attempt at concealment.

Mr. Ross argued that the scope of the commission was large enough. For instance, it investigated the burning of the ballots, although not specified in its instructions, and it could examine any person whose name was mentioned before it, the same as any ordinary court of law. (Ministerial cheers.) In spite of the censorious remarks of Mr. Whitney, the Crown counsel would discharge his duty honorably.

To Safeguard Ballots.

As to the amendments suggested by Mr. Marter, Mr. Ross said they were nearly all covered by the criminal code. In spite of that, he hoped the hon. member would be prepared to assist the Government to make such amendments as would be of benefit. He thought they could properly amend the election law to provide that ballot boxes in controverted cases should be kept in a separate vault, and in this way reduce their chances of destruc-