

(Mr. Bergeron) had the seat stolen from him, where bribery was rampant, of the ordinary and the extraordinary kind, where perjury was resorted to and where personation was reported. Did the government place the Justice Department at the disposal of the gentlemen who were chiefly interested in exposing this wrong-doing? Not so, and it remained for my hon. friend from Beauharnois and his friends at great expense of time, labour and money to bring some of the more guilty ones to justice and place them behind the bars. Then the Justice Department got busy, and worked overtime in their efforts, and eventually they released from prison one of the chief culprits on the ground of failing health. We saw the Prime Minister's colleagues fleeing the country in order to escape personal service for fear that they would be brought before the courts of this country to answer for their political crimes and to explain how they had swept the province of Nova Scotia. They knew how they had swept the province of Nova Scotia by the most questionable methods and they were endeavouring to take advantage of a legal quibble to escape from justice. But there was one hon. gentleman from whom we expected something better, but whom bad company has rather spoiled, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Belding) who removed to another part of the British empire, but who, when he was brought back, took the witness stand and categorically replied to many of the questions that were asked of him: I refuse to answer on the advice of my counsel. If the hon. gentleman had nothing to hide, nothing to screen, I do not think he would have taken that position. What a contrast that is to the position that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition took when he went into the witness box and answered every question honestly and manfully, who had nothing to hide or screen, who had nobody to defend and who therefore answered every question like a man. I do not think that it is a comparison which is at all favourable to the Minister of Finance.

Then, again, we had the perpetrators of the thin red line outrage which we have heard considerable of in the province of Manitoba. I venture to believe that that was an outrage the parallel of which we have never witnessed in any province of this Dominion and which for audacity and boldness has never been surpassed in the history of our country. Returning officers, having had the clerk of the Crown in Chancery send to them the election lists, sent their lists in to be doctored, to be fixed, to use their own expression at the time, by whom? by a judge of the land, an impartial tribunal?—not so, but by a Liberal organizer of the province, Mr. Leach who kept a staff in Winnipeg working night and day for weeks striking out names and disfranchising Conservative electors by the wholesale. When these matters were

brought to the public gaze, did the Dominion government step in and offer to prosecute the guilty ones? Nay, nay. When in 1896 something was brought to their attention by the then Liberal government of the province of Manitoba, which refused to prosecute themselves and threw the entire expense upon the Dominion government, and when, in the constituency of Macdonald, they claimed that there were gross irregularities, they appointed several Liberal lawyers in the west to prosecute and they arrested a good many innocent men. Many of the deputy returning officers were arrested. They spent \$10,000 upon that investigation. Although the bill sent in was \$19,000 or \$20,000, showing that these Liberal officers were out for graft then, the law officers of the Crown cut it down to one-half and the country spent nearly \$10,000 without securing any convictions. But, on this occasion what did we find?—the provincial government—like the Whitney government—doing their duty by placing the wheels of justice in motion. They brought these parties to book and no longer ago than three weeks when the assizes were on at the city of Winnipeg and when these cases were called, what do we see?—a Liberal lawyer in Winnipeg appearing in court. In whose behalf? He appeared to represent the Dominion government. What for? For the purpose of prosecuting the persons accused of these crimes? No, Sir, but for the purpose of defending them. Sir, I am sure it will considerably surprise the members of this House to know that the treasury of this country is placed at the disposal of these men who have been arrested for political crimes in the province of Manitoba. Then, again, there is not only this thin red line, but there are many others. You might take the Prince Albert case. While the government were not directly interested, indirectly they were because they failed to prosecute. A couple of new polls were opened and it was the duty of the returning officer to notify the Conservative candidate. He went away, mailed back to the Conservative candidate a notification of the opening of these new polls, then he came back, met the Conservative candidate and never let him know anything about these polls. The deputy returning officers were sent out to take the vote at these polls in the northern districts. Some of them had been in the employ of this government, they went out, they did not go near the place where they were advertised to hold the polls, but they sat down on the broad prairie 150 miles north of Prince Albert, pulled out their boxes and pulled out their books, entered 150 fictitious names—I believe the Rabbit family figured conspicuously amongst them—placed 150 fictitious ballots in the box every one marked for the Liberal candidate. They did not have the generosity to mark a solitary ballot for the Conservative can-