

ister of Agriculture, who had been doing business on the temperance platform for years, had not the courage to say that there must be an investigation, there was no investigation and, to-day, in the 'Hansard' of parliament and the 'Hansard' of the Senate, there are to be found the names of men—members of this House—who were charged with complicity in these frauds. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) had better abandon the position he has taken to-night, that this government is going to do what is right. Let him take the brave stand which was taken by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), when he answered my hon friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) regarding one of these embezzlers. When he was asked what the government did when these cases are disclosed and the theft laid bare, his reply was: 'The government comes in as administering public affairs and not as administering justice. That is the ground which this government takes. No matter what wrong is committed, no matter what crime is perpetrated, this government, if the accused is a friend of theirs, are going to stand by him. If the people want a government of that kind, let them have it. Every country deserves what it gets. Should a Sodom and Gomorrah overtake this country some day, the people will richly deserve it. We have a government which says, no matter what thieves we may have in our service, we will keep them there because they are party friends. That was the case in the matter of the Thessalon post office. It is childish to say that the explanation which the postmaster gave, that his little girl had stolen \$1,300 out of the till and was never noticed, is even plausible. This government dare not prosecute most of these criminals.'

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend has just been repeating the old accusations concerning the plebiscite vote in the province of Quebec. As regards the hon. gentleman himself, I would not take the trouble to reply, but as there may be others, who do not know him and who may attach some credence to what he says, I wish to say that his statements are absolutely without foundation. The accusations against the province of Quebec were absolutely unfounded and were shown to have been so.

Mr. BENNETT. Why did not the hon. gentleman, in defence of his colleagues, who were branded all over the country—two or three of whom are judges in the province of Quebec—have an inquiry into these accusations?

Mr. FISHER. We had sufficient inquiry to show they were false.

Mr. BENNETT. Was it a public inquiry?

Mr. FISHER. No, there was no necessity for a public inquiry

Mr. BENNETT. Take the record as it stands, and that will prove these charges.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. BENNETT. I have here a few of the polling returns on that occasion. Here is the return for poll No. 3 Quebec Centre. 105 votes were polled and yet there were on the list only 101 names. Would the minister say that was a straight poll? Will this temperance apostle say that in a polling division, where you get only 101 names on the list, 105 votes could be honestly polled. Take poll No. 20 Quebec Centre. There were 121 votes polled and 133 on the list. Take No. 1 Quebec West—114 polled and 115 on the list. No. 2 Quebec West—111 polled, 114 on the list. No. 13 Lachine—108 polled, 111 on the list. St. James No. 20—137 polled, 146 on the list. Richelieu—151 polled, 160 on the list. There was nearly 100 per cent polled of the number on the lists. These were in the French speaking counties where the people were taking very little interest in the vote at all, and mark you in these there was not a single vote for prohibition. Why were 125 votes polled against prohibition when there were only 101 on the list? Go to the counties where there was active interest on both sides. Take Brome represented by the Minister of Agriculture. 1,216 were polled in favour of prohibition and 691 against. In this division both sides were bringing out the vote, yet only 1,917 were polled out of 3,684 on the list. Not much more than 50 per cent voted, and yet in these other divisions, more than 100 per cent of the vote was polled in some of them. Take Huntingdon, there 1,266 voted for prohibition and 221 against. There were 1,487 votes out of 3,363 on the list.

Mr. DEVLIN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the province of Quebec took absolutely no interest in the matter of prohibition?

Mr. BENNETT. I say there was practically no interest taken in it.

Mr. DEVLIN. As I remember, there was a very active interest taken on the question.

Mr. BENNETT. Let me draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the Senate Hansard of 1905. There he will find the keen interest taken, when certain colleagues were stated to have gone to the polls, after the polls had been closed, and urged on the deputy officers that, under instructions from one Pacaud, of Quebec, something desperate had to be done. There is evidence in the Senate debate, page after page of these frauds. What could be more fraudulent than having 105 votes polled in a division where there were only 101 on the list? Will the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) meet a Presbyterian clergyman in my rid-