

may be excused for questioning the wisdom of leaving such cases to judicial decision. I was going to discuss one case, but I shall confine myself to general principle. Let us hope that the proposed amendment, will be of such a character as will put a stop to these frauds. There should be no mincing of the matter. The man convicted of fraud in an election should be incarcerated, and not merely fined. A fine is of no consequence; the party comes to the rescue or gives bail, and if need be, pays the bail. If the bail bonds have been given by supporters of the government, then the government do not exact the bonds. It is only recently in Ontario, since the Whitney government came into power, that the bondsmen have been compelled to pay the penalties for having become surety for the appearance of one of the rascals who stuffed ballot boxes and perpetrated other villainous acts in the province of Ontario.

The address states that the accounts for the past year and the estimates for the past nine months of the proposed fiscal year will be laid before the House of Commons. I notice a singular omission in this paragraph. In old times the paragraph used to contain a sentence to the effect that the estimates would be prepared with due regard to economy. I wonder if the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) insisted on that sentence being left out. If he did he used good sense, because it would be folly to add a sentence of that kind referring to any estimates which might be prepared by the present government. Economy is not a trait of their political character, as can be very well shown by a reference to the public accounts, and a study of the difference between the expenditure to-day and what it was when the present government assumed office.

There is one closing paragraph that must be not only of interest but one in which all will acquiesce. His Excellency says that he trusts our deliberations will be guided by wisdom and moderation. Let us all hope that they may; whether they will or not we may well doubt. The wisdom I question very much, but the admonition to deliberate with wisdom and moderation is very good.

There are one or two points outside of the address to which I should like to call

the attention of the House. This is more particularly in the interest of the Senate itself. Last session my honourable friend from Wellington (Hon. Mr. McMullen) intimated that if important Bills were not brought down in the Senate at an earlier period in the session he would keep the House sitting until proper time was given for their consideration. Promises and threats of that kind coming from supporters of the government are not very apt to be adhered to when the time of trial arrives. But what I want to call the serious attention of the Senate to is this—the exhibition of legislation, for such it may be termed, of last session, I was going to say it was a disgrace to any legislative body. If honourable gentlemen do not like that word disgrace, I will withdraw it, and say it was of a character which should never occur again. What did you see first? Something which I never witnessed before in my thirty-nine or forty years of parliamentary experience. We had a Bill affecting a very important interest at Rainy river; there was great difference of opinion as to the propriety of granting the powers which were asked for in that Bill. We discussed it pro and con for a long time. It came from the committee, was referred to a committee of the whole in this House, and, strange to say, when that committee did meet to consider the question, the whole scope of the Bill was found to be changed. When I compared the original Bill with the one submitted to the committee, I found out where the trouble was. I called the attention of the Secretary of State to the fact that here was a Bill changed in its character, and in its clauses. A different Bill had been substituted and laid before the committee, and if attention had not been called to it, the substituted Bill would have passed without the slightest reference to the irregular and unparliamentary manner in which it was attempted to be carried through the House. There is a gentleman in this House who understands the rules as well as and better than perhaps any of his confreres. He at once knew how to get over the difficulty. He gave notice immediately of a motion to insert these clauses in substitution of the one which had been passed by the committee on the third reading, and moved the suspension of the rules