"As I understand our arrangement, it is as follows :—

"If the appeal to the full court now standing for judgment herein is decided in your favour, of course that disposes of the whole matter and the petition drops, unless I desire to take it to the Supreme Court. If, on the other hand, the appeal is not allowed, then when the trial comes up on the 16th of January, you or your client will admit such bribery by agents as will void the election. No order is to be made as to costs.

"Please write me confirming these terms, and oblige.

"H. M. HOWELL."

On the 16th of the same month, the following was sent to Mr. Howell :—

"H. M. Howell, Esq., Q.C., Winnipeg :
"Re Marquette.

"My Dear Howell,—I have your letter of the 14th instant, and beg to confirm the terms of our arrangement as therein stated subject, of course, to the trial being postponed until judgment is given on our appeal to the full court.

"Yours truly,
"J. STEWART TUPPER."

Under the circumstances, and with this proof in hand, the Attorney General repeated that what he said on the former occasion was absolutely true. He could not understand Mr. Tupper's denial, in the face of his written agreement, unless that gentleman was trying to draw a fine distinction between admitting bribery by agents and agreeing to admit such bribery when the trial occurred. A distinction evidently without a difference.

Before concluding he would like to say a few words on the difficulties that were encountered in these election cases, and this without reflecting on one party any more than the other. The Chamberlain case was a case in point, and those above mentioned show the extreme difficulty in obtaining convictions in these election prosecutions. It had been said by a great English statesman that an average man's political and partisan feelings are to-day a stronger force than his religious convictions. Be this true or not, we must admit that they are potent and that they invade the jury room, and, what is worse, the witness box. We cannot be blind to this fact, and the speaker was quite aware of it when these prosecutions were started, yet the facts which have since then been made public have amply justified the proceedings which the Crown has taken. He was sure the actions of the department of Justice at Ottawa, and of the Attorney General's Department here under Hon. Mr. Sifton and himself have the approval of the vast majority of the people, including the best elements of the Conservative party, and he hoped it would be the means of securing purity of election throughout the whole province.

In dealing with these election cases, he had confined himself thus far to the district of Macdonald, with the exception of the case of Anderson, whose offence was supposed to be committed in Winnipeg and was tried there. There were evidences of gross wrongs committed in other constituencies. Take, for instance, the electoral division of Lisgar, at poll 45, Barnsley, at which W. O. Taylor was the deputy returning officer. Under the Dominion Election Act two agents and no more are allowed for each candidate and for these alone can certificates be issued if they vote at any other poll than that at which their name appears on the list, but at that poll three certificates were granted to agents. In poll 58, at Swan Lake, where Arthur G. Hawkins was the deputy returning officer, four certificates were granted to agents, although objection was taken to such action.

In Provencher, the officials under the Dominion Election Act simply ran riot, and, as a sample of their doings, he would recite that in Poll 1, where E. J. C. Buron was deputy returning officer, the returning officer granted seven certificates to agents of Mr. LaRivière to vote, and all voted, though objected to. In Poll 4, where Miles McDermott acted, the returning officer had granted no less than twenty-three certificates to agents of Mr. LaRivière to vote at this poll. These were objected to, but the votes were all taken.

In conclusion, he could assure the Speaker and the House that nearly all, if not all, the facts mentioned this evening to the House were known to the Crown, either through Hon. Mr. Sifton or himself, and, in view of that knowledge, there was no other possible course open to the department here, or the Department of Justice at Ottawa, than to institute these prosecutions, and, if possible, bring the guilty parties to justice ; and he believed that the people of this province, and in fact the whole of the Dominion, including, as mentioned before, the best elements of the great Conservative party, approved of the duty which had been performed with so much trouble and patience.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have concluded, and I think this statement of facts presented here to-night will prevent a repetition of any such statement as we heard last night from the representative of Marquette (Mr. Roche).

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I move the first resolution pro forma, and without any intention of keeping the House longer.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Very well.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. With that understanding, I now move that the committee do rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would ask the Prime Minister to adopt the usual course under those circumstances, of allowing the same latitude of discussion of the resolutions in committee, as there would be on the general question. A number of hon. gentlemen who were anxious to speak have deferred their remarks in order to let the House go into committee to-night.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier). That has always been understood.

Motion agreed to.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Saturday).