

the debate, that no warrants were issued for these men until about the 16th or 18th. However, the Minister of Justice can give us the exact dates. The important point after all was that two of the men were allowed to escape, and another important point is the fact that the bail in this case was fixed at \$2,000 while, as I am informed by my hon. friend the hon. member for West Hastings, bail in the case of the police magistrate Haryett was fixed at \$20,000. One would have thought that Lott was the man who should have been bailed in a sum of something like \$20,000 and that the bail of the police magistrate might possibly have been fixed at a somewhat smaller sum. It is of course very easy to criticise. There may be some reason which is not apparent to me which would explain this, but at all events it is obvious that the bail fixed in the case of Lott was perfectly inadequate and as a result he was enabled to leave the country and to escape prosecution or punishment in company with two other men who were not arrested at all. It does not seem to me that the result can be regarded as at all satisfactory. In so far as the details of the dates are concerned I have no personal knowledge. All I am dealing with at this moment is the result. There are two or three circumstances in connection with this matter that seem to call for some comment and one of these is the circumstance that ballots were delivered from the printing office in the city of Ottawa upon a mere telephone message. It must be remembered that no scheme of this kind can be worked successfully so as to defeat the will of the people unless a supply of apparently genuine ballots is at hand, and unless deputy returning officers are appointed who will be unscrupulous enough to lend themselves to such a conspiracy. It appears that upon the same day, as far as we can judge, on which Lott made a visit to Ottawa, after unsuccessfully attempting to procure these ballots in another way, 1,000 ballots were delivered upon a mere telephone message to some person or persons unknown who were presumably acting on behalf of the returning officer or his assistants in the city of Ottawa. I do not know how that may be. I would suppose that ballot papers demanded in excess of those originally supplied would be given out only upon a written requisition signed by a responsible person—that would be by the returning officer—and that an exact record of their delivery, the person to whom they were delivered and the reasons why they were delivered would be kept in every case. We do not seem to have that certificate and it seems a remarkable loose way of transacting business and one which lends itself to the perpetration of frauds of this kind, and to the successful carrying out of a conspiracy such as this. As to the extent to which this conspiracy was successfully carried out, let it be remembered that it is only a matter of con-

jecture. It is very probable that only a portion of this fraud has made itself apparent and that much more remains below the surface. There is one matter to which the Minister of Justice alluded in terms of somewhat severe comment, but he did not go far enough. It appears that a man named Hawkey, against whom a warrant was issued after he left the country, did not even reside in the riding for which he was appointed deputy returning officer. The returning officers have been declared by very eminent authority to be officers of this House and to be punishable as such. They should be respectable men and men above suspicion. I would not think it wise or right that a strong partisan should be appointed, or that the appointee should be a man who would lend himself to either one political party or the other in connection with any proceeding in an election. It appears that the returning officer for Frontenac saw fit to appoint his deputy returning officers upon the nomination of the Liberal organization of that riding. I submit to the Minister of Justice, I submit to the members of the government, I submit to gentlemen on that side of the House, that this was a most extraordinary and outrageous procedure for that returning officer to follow. He should have appointed the deputy returning officers, not because they are nominated by one political organization or the other, but because they are fair and honest and competent. That is the only reason which ought to actuate him in making such an appointment. Not only did this Mr. Forsythe, the returning officer for Frontenac appoint his deputy returning officers upon the nomination of the Liberal committee, but he insisted upon appointing one who was a non-resident in the riding and who was brought from the city of Chicago no doubt for the very purpose which was to be subverted by these bogus ballot boxes. The Minister of Justice has spoken of that as an outrage. It is not only an outrage so far as the appointment of Hawkey is concerned, but it seems to me that the Minister of Justice might have said that it is an outrage to appoint as returning officer any man who has no higher conception of his duties than Forsythe seems to have had. This man, Hawkey was brought from Chicago, brought for a criminal purpose beyond doubt, and brought for a purpose connected with these very bogus ballot boxes which were certainly used in one polling district at least. And when the Conservative candidate for the riding objected to the appointment of Hawkey because he came from outside the riding, the answer which he got from this man who should be an impartial servant of parliament was: that Hawkey must be appointed because forsooth he was the nominee of the Liberal committee. It does not seem to me that partisanship, that unfairness and