

been useless to proceed without them. These reasons are not generally acceptable, and the Government cannot escape the suspicion of not being anxious for a conviction. The necessity for an immediate prosecution appears to be evident from this experience. The election case judges should have the power to apply the punishment when they find the wrong-doers and the evidence of their offences. Why should two years elapse between the detection of the crime and the atonement for it? The curious feature of this case is the fact that the man, who is held by one court to be guilty of dealing fraudulently with the ballots cast in his division, is acquitted in another. True, the ballots that were present in the one instance were not present in the other, though they, of themselves, could prove nothing. The ballots were switched. That is certain. Who did it? The voters or the deputy-returning officer? The latter says he did not, and one of the scrutineers, who was detailed to watch him, says Wildfong did not miscount or alter the ballots as he took them out of the box. The voters in the case could have been sworn. Why was this not done? Supposing that they declared on oath, that each ballot was free of the marks that were found upon it, would the returning officer not be obliged to account for the marks or stand accused of switching? The man has been acquitted, but there is something about the case which is unsatisfactory, and which calls for a change in the routine of election trials. The judges who find the wrong-doers should punish them at once, and the law should be amended so as to permit of this being done."

The speaker then took up what he termed the infamous census circular sent out by Ontario members of the Legislature in bunches to be put in the hands of census enumerators. The idea was to secure from them information which would give the Liberals control of the voters' lists, and every enumerator who conveyed that information would have committed perjury. Here is what Mr. Ross said about it:—

"He had heard of the circular referred to by Mr. Whitney. He did not see what danger there was in it. Whom would it injure? He did not see that there was any political significance in it, or anything of a hurtful or degrading character! He did not presume that every census enumerator would perjure himself to give the information. Mr. Whitney tried to divert attention from the Government's general record, and snatch a victory."

No wonder the census got into a snarl. Instead of attending to their duties the enumerators were perjuring themselves to give information in order to gain an advantage over the Conservative party.

PROLONGING THEIR LIFE.

Mr. Whitney then assailed the Government's action in seeking to prolong its own life by extending the term of Parliament. He was in a position to say that he believed the Minister of Justice at Ottawa had denounced it. It remained to be seen how far the Government would go in this last attempt of theirs to stifle the will of the province. What was the object? Was it to cover up a gerrymander and prevent the Opposition from fighting to the death, till the time of the Legislature expired, to prevent it? What did the Globe say?

"All that it does is to remove from the Opposition the temptation to embarrass the Government by obstructing business in the Legislature until such time as the House would be virtually dissolved by the arrival of the date that constitutionally terminate its existence."

He had also an extract from the Ottawa Free Press, an organ of the Ontario and Dominion Governments, denouncing this bill in the strongest possible language. This extract read:

"The current Weekly Sun contains a paragraph which runs: The Act of the Ontario Legislature prolonging its own existence beyond the legal term, we are told, is pronounced constitutional by the highest authority. What authority