

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—That is the last election one would expect a Liberal to speak of. If there ever was an election that disgraced a city and the parties connected with it, it was the London election.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—I refer to it to show that something similar to what the hon. gentleman has described as having occurred in Hastings took place in London. Although the majority was twelve or thirteen hundred, the defeated candidate asked for a recount, and it was discovered that a great number of ballots were marked as the hon. gentleman described, with a little cross, evidently put there before the ballots were deposited in the boxes.

The clause was adopted.

On clause 33,

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—This provides against the employment, I suppose, of strangers to canvass in a constituency. Can my hon. friend tell us why this clause is inserted?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—There have been a couple of instances of persons from the United States being engaged to canvass in elections.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Middlesex)—In the last election, persons came from Buffalo and canvassed in the county of Lennox, and when they were wanted for witnesses when the election was protested, they could not be found. The suspicion was that they had been doing something irregular. If they could have been caught during the canvass you had them, but there was no law to indict them. I think the clause is a good one.

The clause was adopted.

On clause 36,

36. No company or association other than one incorporated for political purposes alone shall, directly or indirectly, contribute, loan, advance, pay or promise or offer to pay any money or its equivalent to, or for, or in aid of, any candidate at an election, or to, or for, or in aid of, any political party, committee, or association, or to, or for, or in aid of, any company incorporated for political purposes, or to, or for, or in furtherance of, any political purpose whatever, or for the indemnification or reimbursement of any person for moneys so used.

2. Every director, shareholder, officer, attorney, or agent, of any company or association violating the provisions of this section, who aids, abets, advises, or takes part in, any such violation, and every person who asks or knowingly receives any money or its equivalent in violation of the provisions of this section, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars, or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years, or to both.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I want to call attention to an important omission from this Bill. I do not find any clause providing for the punishment of ministers who promise the expenditure of public money in constituencies in order to secure the return of government candidates. We have illustrations of ministers going into constituencies and promising to construct post offices, bridges, railways and all sorts of public works. Is it not a greater crime for a minister, who is in a position to carry out his promises, though he uses the public funds to do so, than it is for a private individual to make promises to electors in case his candidate is elected?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Middlesex)—If you go that far, you will have to abolish Supplementary Estimates.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—A very good suggestion, indeed. More particularly when you consult, as my hon. friend no doubt has consulted, the last supplementary estimates laid before parliament, where we find some hundreds of appropriations for bridges, post offices and all kinds of works on the eve of an election. My hon. friend, the Secretary of State, might consider it improper if I were to ask him if there is a probability of an election before snow fall this year, because the supplementary estimates furnish very strong indications that the elections are near at hand. Does not my hon. friend think, in all seriousness, particularly if he were on this side of the House, and we were on that side of the House and had power to carry out the promises made by members of the present government, that we should either cease to be members of the government or be severely punished or disqualified? I put these questions in all seriousness. I am strongly of the opinion that it should be done. It is not a new idea, because when the election law was under consideration some years ago, I proposed such an amendment, but the virtue of the major-