

terfering with a pure election. I think, therefore, the hon. gentleman, was not justified in ascribing the frauds which have been practised, and of which he gave only one illustration, that of London—I say that he was not justified in the criticism that he made after the course pursued by the government. I am quite as free to condemn what occurred in London as any one. No one could defend it, but you must remember the environments. With reference to all this bribery, it is strange to say that in the statements made by the parties, four-fifths of them declared that they were going to vote for Hyman anyway, so that it did not materially affect the result. Mr. Hyman was elected by a majority of over 400, or in the neighbourhood of 400. No such number as that, nor one-half, nor one-fourth of that number have been shown to be bribed. It was not shown by the evidence that Hyman was cognizant of it. It must have been known to the London people, and why did they not file a protest and contest the election and then the whole matter would have been brought out squarely and the trial judges could have disfranchised those voters who were found guilty of accepting a bribe? There was the opportunity. The Conservatives did not do it. Why did they not do it? The only conclusion one reaches is that they were just as bad themselves if not worse. By common consent nothing was said about it. The environment of London had not a very good record in the past. I do not propose to go into it. I do not propose to refer to it at all. It is not a matter for this Chamber, but no one will deny the statement I make that it was not the first time that charges of corruption had been made with reference to London elections. The hon. gentleman spoke about ballot switching and talked about it existing everywhere. He did not define where everywhere was. It is very well known where it began. It was when Mr. Birmingham sent Freeborn up to Manitoba in 1896. The evidence all came out in the courts. It was well known there that he went around and instructed parties at the different polls how they were to switch the ballots. That was the first time we ever heard of ballot switching.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—He was a good man in North Bruce.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I do not know about that. My hon. friend can tell us about it. But there is the fact that it was practised on a large scale and that it came before the court. At least one member was unseated on the evidence disclosed in Manitoba. So that I think that the hon. gentleman was not justified in the extreme language in which he indulged and in which I would be sorry to follow him, giving us no positive evidence, simply generalities, expecting everybody to believe the statements he made. According to his view the majority of the Liberal party were elected just the same way. I think the hon. gentleman could not be sustained even by his own friends in the extreme statement that he made on that point to the House last night. The hon. gentleman said that he did not believe it himself. I do not think it is dignified to make a statement of that kind in this Chamber unless they have a fair and honest basis. There are many gentlemen who have vivid recollections of fraud having been practised on them by the Conservative party. I think there are many sitting in this Chamber to-day in that position. I have heard reference to it in the past. Perhaps if these hon. gentlemen are invited to speak they will be able to throw some light upon what frauds have been perpetrated in the past. If I choose to go into that sort of work I could give the House a great many instances that would rather startle hon. members. My recollection goes back a very long time. My first remembrance of elections is when an election occupied a week. Then there was but one polling place, and the stronger side carried the day; when each side had a house open, and when men hung around and drank for three days in the week at the expense of one candidate and for the other three days at the expense of the other candidate. Nothing but debauchery during the whole period. Then the next change was the creating of a number of polling divisions. Then came the law reducing the time to two days. In my recollection the voting extended for two days—open voting. I will not say what occurred upon such occasions; I could throw some considerable light upon the subject if I wished to go into it, but I do not choose to do so. At that time the contested elections were decided