

3. That a department of government be established directed by an independent chief to enforce the law.

He thinks that No. 1 has the demerit of simple inutility. But I answer, not so if No. 3 be operative.

He condemns No. 2 as reactionary and labels it as a partnership between the State and the criminal. But is the suggestion not already a settled principle of our law. Do we not now offer protection to this very class of witness to obtain his evidence and have we not heard of "King's evidence." In any case the object is not "to elevate the morals of the people" but to root out crime and the criminals.

Tammany was an unfortunate reference by Mr. McLeod, for Tammany was organized as a truly patriotic society with lofty aspirations, but became the noxious political instrument it is only when low and depraved operators such as Tweed and his associates were permitted to get control and ply their trade. Our people are now in inclination and intention as pure as Tammany once was, but wait, as Mr. McLeod would suggest, until the corruptionists and their organizers have become too strong for control and we may see Canada as hopeless if our neighbours are under their present day Tammany. Wait until that impossible time when the five per cent. of corruptibles have become pure in heart, wait until mortal man has become divine, and until when, by reason of universal purity, the need or occasion of laws to control corruption has disappeared!

I do not intend to attempt discussion of new matter along this subject, but may I endorse the suggestion that personal canvass should be included in the category of corrupt acts. It certainly is so where the relations of the parties imply an element of duress, and where the victim, if of opposite political opinion, must either stultify himself with a lying promise or sacrifice himself to the power of the canvasser by a manly refusal. This has long been a fixed conclusion of my own.

It has also occurred to me that a duty might be imposed upon the court to direct an investigation in connection with any cases of election petitions where charges are dropped or where any circumstances might suggest the propriety of an enquiry.

Why could not petitioners under our present procedure be required to file complete particulars and statement of their evi-