

been any scandal exposed comparable to the scandal which is now exposed in the city of Toronto and that which has recently been exposed in the province of Manitoba. Does this not establish the fact that the Liberal party has been guilty to a much greater extent than the Conservative party? The Liberal party would not exercise its generosity and magnanimity to the Conservative party in thus concealing scandals for which they were responsible, if they, while administering the criminal machinery of this Dominion could thus have exposed the acts of their opponents. If anything proves beyond all question that the Conservative party have been fairly exempt from guiltiness for electoral rottenness, it is the fact that you cannot point out in any of the provinces of Canada, under a local Liberal administration administering the criminal laws of the province, an exposure worth speaking of. I thus say without fear of contradiction that this very fact establishes that the Conservative party is not one tittle as guilty of electoral corruption as the corruption of which the Liberal party has been guilty. However, hon. gentlemen, recriminations will not assist in purifying the political atmosphere. I simply make reference to the fact I have now mentioned to establish, as far as I possibly can, the comparative freedom of the Conservative party from the guilt that I have pointed out which has marked the administration of Liberal affairs. As I said before, both political parties should join hands in the endeavour to place upon the statute-book one of the most effective Acts which it has ever been the opportunity of parliament to pass. I am sure there is enough patriotism and honesty and enough sense of decency in both parties to join in the effort to wipe out this corruption. I might say that there are other considerations in connection with this subject than the success or failure of either political party. There are the ethical considerations which grow out of a deliberate violation of election laws. It is idle for the public to build churches, to build schools, to attempt to inculcate the principles of religion and morals into the minds of the youth of the country, if the foundations of our political life be submerged in the corruption and rottenness which mark so largely the disclosures which have lately taken

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED.

place. The morals of the country are the reflex of its rulers and government, as the stream will rise no higher than its source: so it may be said with a great deal of force that the morals and religion of the people will not rise any higher than the moral principles of its rulers or government. I therefore venture to hope, hon. gentlemen, that the ventilation of these scandals will clear the atmosphere and result in a higher standard of public life being observed and adopted throughout our Dominion. There is another subject which I should like to make a few observations upon, but which subject has not been alluded to in the address. I refer to the dispute which has arisen between the colony of Newfoundland and the imperial government. It is a matter of considerable public importance that the protest which has been made by Newfoundland to the imperial authorities against the renewal of the *modus vivendi* should receive some attention at the hands of this parliament.

The question resolves itself into this proposition, whether without the concurrence and consent of the colony interested, the imperial authorities will assume to deal with matters relating to the rights and the dominions of the colony in question. The statute law of the colony of Newfoundland has been deliberately ignored by the imperial government and the colony has been humiliated in having to yield obedience to a '*modus vivendi*' which has been passed between the two governments, but against the protest of Newfoundland. Thus a self-governing colony is driven to submit to an agreement entered into by the colonial minister in London without in any sense being responsible to the colony whose rights or dominions he assumes to barter away. It seems to me this should not involve any detailed consideration of the Bait Act. The legislation in question was certainly within the rights of the colony, and whether that Bait Act is possessed of merit or not will not affect the principle involved in the dispute which has taken place between the two governments. I venture to say that the action of the imperial government is so far reaching in practically handing over the territorial rights of Newfoundland to the United States government, that if the same question should arise in Canada and the