

could have obtained the labour to meet the demand. No such prosperity at any time during what was called the National Policy stimulated the industries as they have been stimulated in the last nine years. It requires no evidence of that. There is no manufacturer in Canada who will deny it. It is not pretended at all. So that the policy adopted, even a modified policy as far as tariff was concerned, has not only benefited the whole country, but has actually benefited the manufacturing industries. The people were able to buy more from them; had more money to spare, and so the manufacturers received the benefit of it.

Now, I come to a branch of the subject in which my hon. friend was even more bitter and more severe in condemning and in holding this government responsible, and that is the frauds practised at elections. Let me quote his language. He said:

'Can we for one moment conceive that the gangs of political pluggers, switchers and bribers that have passed up and down this Dominion for some years as has been established in the tribunals to which I am referring, have been set in motion of their own volition? It must appeal to the intelligence of every public man that this machine, made up of these law-breakers, would not have been set in motion by themselves.'

Then he goes on to say: 'It is idle for the government to deny the responsibility.' These are his very words. I say there is no justification for that statement. Both parties have from time to time in the last 50 or 60 years, to my knowledge, contributed to secure greater purity in election. If the record is examined carefully, it will be found that the Liberals have suffered more from the fact that the Conservatives were in office for a longer period. A larger number of amendments made to the election law in the direction of securing greater and freer exercise of the franchise were made by the Liberal party. I have under my hand here a law, the larger portion of which is in force to-day, that the Conservative party in their eighteen years did not improve or modify. It was passed in the year 1874, during the administration of which my hon. friend and myself were members. It was improved somewhat in this Chamber when it came up here. It

Hon. Mr. SCOTT.

provided the most stringent clauses against bribery, against switching ballots, against every possible device that could be conceived of, that had been practised either before or since. I may say also that it is due to that same government that the system of voting by ballot was introduced. That was thought to be an advance, and to-day is regarded by the majority of people as a material benefit to the exercise of the franchise, enabling every man to give his vote privately and secretly, without compulsion or intimidation, and if he does take a bribe the man who bribes him is not sure how he votes after all, unless the switching is adopted. I will just refer to to the Act of 1874. I have looked casually over the election law, and I do not find that it has been materially altered. Section 68 provides for the cases of forging or counterfeiting or fraudulently altering or defacing ballot papers, or supplying ballot papers to any person other than the legitimate voter, putting into any ballot box a ballot not authorized by law, and a variety of cases of the same character. The fine to be imposed was not to exceed \$1,000. The imprisonment was to be for any term less than two years. That is as far as ballots were concerned. There were provisions made in regard to the custody of the ballot boxes; provisions for the maintaining of secrecy, severe punishments being provided in case of personation, which was to be punished by a fine not exceeding \$200 and a term of imprisonment not exceeding six months. If a candidate was convicted of having taken part in the crime of personation, he shall be disqualified from being a candidate at that election. Then strangers were not allowed to enter the polling district armed. Entertainments were forbidden, ribbons and flags were not allowed, taverns were to be closed, and so on. Now, the definitions of bribery, I believe, are much the same. I need not read them all, but they are under section 92. I compared some of them, and I find that they are word for word with this. Some changes have taken place no doubt in other clauses, but the majority of the clauses—and they are very full, extending over a number of pages—provide the most ample remedies and punishments for parties who are in any way guilty of bribery or impersonation or in-