

what I might call connivance, could go further. I venture to think that the government of this country in appointing such a man as returning officer make themselves—without design it may be—a party to this conspiracy. Let them appoint Liberals if you like, but let them appoint men who are above suspicion. There are many Liberals in every riding in this country who are above suspicion, and who would be trusted by their Conservative opponents just as they would trust any Conservative in the land. Appoint such men and we have no criticism, but appoint a man like this Frontenac returning officer who has no higher conception of his duties than that he is to make himself the tool of the Liberal committee in the riding, and you lend yourselves—I do not care whether you are Liberals or Conservatives—you make yourself parties to just such a conspiracy as was partly carried out in these two ridings. Let every hon. gentleman upon the treasury benches bear in mind, that when the government of Canada consents to the appointment of violent partisans who are willing to put aside for political purposes those principles which undoubtedly they would adhere to in private dealings—unfortunately we know there are such—the government is lending itself to some extent to the perpetration of exactly the frauds which have been described by my hon. friend (Mr. Porter). I regret very much that the action of the government, however well intended it may have been, has resulted in the escape of the three men who above all others should have been placed upon trial. I refer to Lott the candidate, Shibley, another candidate, and Hawkey, the deputy returning officer brought from Chicago for a very obvious purpose. The Minister of Justice has given the dates in order to show the diligence which he believes the government exercised in the matter. After all the best comment upon it is the fact that notwithstanding all this supposed diligence the three criminals most deeply concerned in this outrage on the liberties and rights of a free people have been permitted to escape from Canada and are now enjoying themselves in the United States.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have had an opportunity of looking at the report prepared by the Commissioner of Police, and I wish to be exact about the dates. On the 4th of November the interview took place between Mr. Porter and the returning officer; on the 7th of November the returning officer wrote the letter which I quoted, to the Hon. Mr. Scott; on the same day inspector Chamberlain left for Belleville, arriving on the 8th; on the 11th of November Mr. Shepley and Mr. Sherwood went to Belleville for the purpose of taking proceedings and the warrants were not issued until the 19th of November. I was wrong and my hon. friend was right as to that. The reason assigned by Mr. Shepley was

* Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

that he awaited the result of the criminal libel proceedings so that he might get the information necessary to enable him to issue a warrant.

Mr. PORTER. I want to make a reference to one or two statements made by the Minister of Justice in answer to my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) stated that the expenses of this investigation in which all the information was brought out and upon which the police force employed by the government acted, were paid for by private individuals and not by the government as should have been the case. The answer given by the Minister of Justice was that the government had paid all the counsel and the witnesses. In regard to that statement I desire to take issue most emphatically with the minister. A large number of the witnesses in that investigation were paid for by myself, and Mr. Duvernet the counsel who was employed in that case was paid by private individuals and not by the Crown.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. At whose instigation were the warrants signed?

Mr. PORTER. At my instigation.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Was the hon. gentleman the complainant?

Mr. PORTER. I speak of the criminal libel case, the only one in which I was interested.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I was speaking of the warrants in connection with the matters complained of.

Mr. PORTER. What I wish to point out is, that in regard to these warrants there was no investigation; the parties were simply brought before the court and bail taken. There were no witnesses, and there was no counsel except Mr. Shepley, who is employed generally on behalf of the government. The witnesses in the first investigation, where the facts were brought out, were paid for by myself, and counsel was paid by private individuals.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. With the libel suit we had not anything to do, and I never contended that we had.

Mr. PORTER. When the trial took place before the high court of justice at Belleville, the witness and the counsel engaged at the trial were not paid for by this government, but were paid for by the Ontario government under the leadership of Mr. Whitney; so that that statement of the minister is not borne out by the facts. I desire to refer to just one other matter which has been mentioned by the Minister of Justice. If I understood his statement correctly, he said that all the ballot boxes that had been imported for these fraudulent purposes had been accounted for except one, and, pointing to the one which