

they liked in the way of seating and unseating members, and there was seldom a Parliament in which there were not several members sitting who were not elected, and frequently the whole majority of the Government was composed of such usurping members. Incidentally, the figures above given also show that the expenditure of large sums (as brought to light in the election courts) made by the Conservatives of Ontario in the hope of reversing the judgment at the polls has been a thoroughly unremunerative investment.

#### **Members Unseated Since Confederation.**

Since Confederation, the Liberals in Ontario have carried 558 seats as against 369 by the Conservatives. The percentage of Liberals unseated has therefore been 5.55%, and of Conservatives 9.05%.

In other words, one Liberal out of every eighteen has been unseated, and one Conservative out of every ten and a half; that is, there has been almost twice as much bribery and corruption proved against the Conservatives per capita as against the Liberals. Is there a parallel case in any age or country, under parliamentary institutions, where the corruption has been proved to be on the Opposition side?

#### **Election Trials by Judges Instead of by Committees.**

The placing of the trials of election petitions in the hands of the judges instead of in the hands of partisan parliamentary committees was wholly the work of the Liberal party, both in the Dominion and Ontario. The Conservative party in both Houses resisted the reform strongly year after year, and only surrendered when defeat was staring them in the face.

Under the Parliamentary Committee system, so tenaciously held by the Tories, gross injustices were perpetrated by packed tribunals, dilatory proceedings, partisan examinations and unjust verdicts, as the few examples hereunder given will prove. It was the regular practice, by the use of every kind of chicanery and fraud, to unseat a member if a Liberal, and to seat him if a Conservative. If it was found impossible to refuse to unseat a Conservative, it was the practice to lengthen the trials session after session, the usurping member retaining his seat in the meantime, and in one case until nearly a whole parliament had run its course before the Committee unseated their friend.

The arguments of the Conservative leaders against the transference to the courts were strangely alike in both Houses, viz., that they should be in haste to adopt this form of English legislation, etc. The Tory party to a man voted against the reform measures of Mr. Blake, Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Brown in this matter until the Tory leaders, in the face of the defeat that was threatening them, surrendered and voted for the measures which they had before ignominiously kicked out of both Parliaments.