

that the farmer needs protection or that the farmer got protection." The farmer does not think so; he has said, on several successive occasions, by his vote and his voice, that he does not think so. Then, the hon. gentleman said: "The free admission of grain in 1878 was not detrimental to the interests of the farmer; it did not in the slightest degree interfere with the farmer." Well, he voted differently. The hon. gentleman said further: "The importation of Indian corn was a distinct advantage to the farmers of Canada." Then, we had the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Semple), who, instead of advocating the policy laid down by his leader, free trade as they have it in England, said: "We can never have free trade as they have it in England, because our conditions are different." I take it, therefore, that the hon. gentleman must come into our ranks, because if his party are advocating free trade as they have it in England, he cannot be one of them. Then, I take the hon. member for Addington (Mr. Dawson), who spoke last night. He told us that everything was made dearer in Canada by the National Policy, and that the danger of the situation to-day is that we are drifting into boodling and corruption, and that we want a pure and economical Administration. I wondered at the time if the hon. gentleman had considered what was the result of the searchlight of the courts being thrown upon hon. gentlemen opposite after the last general elections. He said: "We may expect, if that Order in Council relative to the Hudson Bay Railway is carried out, that the Government may get 10 per cent of the money for election purposes;" and, therefore, he said, speaking to the country, "You want an economical Administration and one that will not indulge in boodling, but that will honestly and faithfully attend to its duties." Now, when the searchlight of the courts was thrown upon the hon. gentleman's friends after the last elections, was it found that there was no boodling among them, and that they were pure? I have here a list of the men who were unseated; and, as there are fewer representatives of the Opposition in this House than on the Government side, if the proportion on both sides were the same, the number ought to be larger on the Government side. But what do we find? We find that the courts decided that there were evidences of corruption sufficient to unseat the Reform members for the following constituencies: Lincoln, East Bruce, Soulanges, Peel, Queen's, N.S., Lennox, North Victoria, Digby, N.S., King's, N.S., Ontario South, Huron West, Vaudreuil, East Simcoe, London, South Perth, Monck, Montmorency, Northumberland West, Carleton, N.B., Prescott, Welland, North Perth, L'Assomption, Pontiac and Chicoutimi. Twenty-five of those men who were so pure, went down when the

searchlight of the courts was thrown upon them.

Mr. WALLACE. What was the politics of those twenty-five men?

Mr. SPROULE. They were all on the Reform side, and they were the men who the hon. member for Addington says should be put in charge of the affairs of this country, because they are so pure and honest and free from boodling. The courts said they were not, and unseated them because of corruption, and what did the electors say when they went back for re-election? The electorate said: "We believe you are not pure; we believe you are dishonest," because they left at home the Reform candidates in the following constituencies: East Bruce, Soulanges, Lennox, North Victoria, South Ontario, West Huron, Vaudreuil, East Simcoe, London, South Perth, Monck, Montmorency, Northumberland West, L'Assomption, Pontiac and Chicoutimi. To sixteen of those twenty-five men, the electorate of the country, when asked their opinion, said: "We believe you are not as pure as you ought to be," and left them at home, and put Conservatives in their places. Now, how many Conservatives were unseated by the courts? There were thirteen in all, although if they had been unseated in the same proportion as the members of the Reform party, there would have been more than twice the number. And when those Conservative candidates who were unseated went back to the people, what was the result? They were re-elected for the following constituencies: Glengarry, Richmond, N.S., Cumberland, N.S., Halton, Halifax (both members), Prince Edward, East Middlesex, Victoria, East Elgin, Montcalm, Brome and Soulanges. Only one out of the whole number failed to be returned.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask a question? Do I understand his argument to be that those respectable Conservative gentlemen who were unseated were impure and dishonest?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not talking about Conservative members. I am talking about the argument of the hon. gentleman who spoke last night. He said: "If the country wants purity and no boodling, return the Reform party to power." Where did the courts leave them after the last elections? They left them out. Where did the people leave them when they returned for re-election? They left them at home. Both the courts and the people said they had no confidence in their professions of purity and honesty. But the hon. gentleman said, "The Government have an Order in Council before this House to subsidize a railway to Hudson Bay, and what does it mean? It may mean that they are going to get out of that subsidy money to run the elections. "If