Seme Examples of Tory Election Trials by Parliamentary

Many flagrant examples of Tory manipulation of election trials by partisan Parliamentary Committees might be given. The following specimens will suffice, the first bling

The Quebec City Case of 1858,

When the Conservative Government of the day practically entered into a conspiracy to keep three usurpers in the Quebec seats. At the general elections of 1858 Alleyn, Dubord and Simard, Government supporters, were declared elected, took their seats and voted as members. As soon as the House met a motion was made that the three members were elected by a number of votes wholly disproportionate to the population of the city, and that a large number of fictitious names were inscribed on the poll books, rendering a scrutiny impossible and asking that the return be declared null and void. An amendment, that the matter be referred to a select committee of the House, to inquire whether any facts existed requiring the House to anticipate the action of the General Committee on Elections, was negatived. Another amendment, for an inquiry at the Bar of the Touse, with a view to prompt punishment of the 1858, 1859 and until April 16, 1860. One of the members of the committee persistently absented himself, and was several times reported to the House, but was excused by party votes. A report was finally brought in on April 16, 1860, stating that huge frauds had been committed, that intimidation and violence were practised to a great extent, that two lives had been lost in the disorder, that a large number of persons voted without qualification and many several times; that men armed with sticks were allowed to remain in possession of the polls, and gross and open irregularities were permitted by the deputy returning officers; that the poll book was stolen and when returned 5,000 fictitious names had been added to it.

The Committee declared the election void and recommended that Quebec should be disfranchised for the remainder of that Parliament. The latter recommendation was not adopted.

Why is this old case mentioned? Simply because the fraudulent methods then adopted, in order to secure the seats for the Conservative candidates, are the same as those utilized ever since by that party to accomplish its illegal ends.

Another flagrant attempt to thwart the will of the people was

The Russell County Case of 1858,

When Mr. Fellows (Con.) was returned as elected by a majority of 14, but it was afterwards proved that in the township of Cambridge