

at the right time, but I throw these out in order that hon. gentlemen may have an opportunity of thinking it over, and I shall be glad of any advice or assistance that can be given in the way of perfecting and improving our system of securing pure elections. From the review I have given, we must all admit that a very great improvement has been made, in the election law—that the method of securing fair and pure elections has been enormously advanced. Unfortunately bribery is a most difficult element to combat. The tendency of the age is for the acquisition of money. Wealth seems to be an ideal point that all are seeking to attain. Naturally those who have not it seek to obtain it in ways that oftentimes are not justifiable. Possibly influences across the line have something to do with it. I notice that Mr. Hearst admits having spent over \$260,000—over a quarter of a million, in the contest for Governor of the State of New York. So that it is an extremely difficult problem to check bribery. I think it is manifestly unfair for the hon. gentleman to hold the government in any way responsible. They have not the execution of those laws. If any of the cases to which the hon. gentleman adverted had come under the purview of the courts, something would have been accomplished, because the briber would have been disfranchised, and the court could report anybody found guilty of crime to the House and due punishment would have been awarded, but it was allowed to go. An inquiry was made for political purposes. The man who started it was a Liberal. He professed to have expended seven or eight hundred dollars of his own money, and demanded from Mr. Hyman's committee payment of this amount and something more. The committee declined to be blackmailed, and he warned them what the consequence would be. They never dreamed that he could make such a disclosure, or that there was such a disclosure to be made. I am told—I do not make the statement on my own authority—that the Conservative party paid this man a considerable sum, a good deal more than he could get from the other side, for the information which he subsequently gave as to the men who had been bribed.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—If the hon. gentleman had read the evidence care-

fully, he would have found that that was positively denied.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—There is a gentleman present who can substantiate it. I do not know that I have any observations to make on the controversy existing between Newfoundland and the United States. I think it was rather unfortunate to drag it into this Chamber, because the Chamber was not in possession of all the facts. The hon. gentleman assumed that the British government were not warranted in giving permission for the present season only to the United States fishermen to fish in the waters that were referred to in the controversy. Now I have looked very carefully over the points in issue and I think the British government made only one mistake, and that was in allowing one of the terms, namely that the United States fishermen were to be permitted the use of purse seines, because that was against the law of Newfoundland and of Canada. Canada was in a measure a party to the arrangement, because it refers to those portions of Newfoundland that were mentioned in the treaty of 1818, in which United States fishermen were given the same rights as Newfoundland fishermen possessed. There was no qualification to that. In reference to the points that were named, whatever rights the Newfoundland fishermen had, the United States fishermen had under the treaty of 1818. That also covers parts of Canada—the Magdalen Islands and the Labrador coast. We made no protest, but it became evident before anything had been done that the United States discovered a mistake had been made, because the fishermen agreed at once of their own motion apparently, but no doubt under the influence of the United States government, not to avail themselves of the permission to use purse seines because the use of purse seines is contrary to the laws both of Canada and of Newfoundland. But, outside of that, I do not think that the observations made by my hon. friend were quite justified without a fuller knowledge of the facts. The treaty of 1818 has been a good deal commented upon. The United States is endeavouring to get away from it. It has never been repealed, although they maintain that tacitly it has been revoked. The facts will not bear out that contention. It was a pretty hard treaty no doubt. It was made at the