

them. 118 men voted, 123 ballots came out of the box. You can see that no ordinary commonplace Conservative could do that. It required a conjuror, one of those fellows who can bring any quantity of ribbons out of his mouth, or one of those Chinese conjurors who bring out of a box what they do not put into it.

Mr. WOOD. Was he not a Conservative ?

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, no, he was not. He was proved to have been a Liberal. But, Mr. Speaker, suppose he were a Conservative, he would have been a Conservative who had left the ranks of Conservatism, like the present Minister of Public Works, and others of that ilk in the present ministry, and who show themselves more demoralized than the worst of the Liberals. Of the 123 ballots, 72 were for Holmes, 40 were for McLean, 10 had no mark, and 1 was rejected. The ballot box must, therefore, have been stuffed to the extent of 5 ballots, at least. All the ballots marked for McLean were initialled, several for Holmes were not initialled, and 22 of an entirely different appearance from the remaining ballots marked for Holmes, different from all marked for McLean, and different from the unmarked ballots—22 obviously bogus. Fifty-five men solemnly averred or swore that they had voted for McLean at this poll, although only 40 ballots of the 55 were found for him. Of the 55, 35 were examined, and nine were present waiting to be examined, but the Liberal members would not sit in the evenings.

What about Farr ? We ought to pause when we speak about Farr. He and several others, Cap. Sullivan and Dan Ferguson, the slugger and the plugger, are dear to the last acquisition to this ministry, the hon. gentleman from North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland)—very dear to his heart on various accounts. These gentlemen had one prominent amongst them, and that was Farr. And what was his history ? I was present at the meeting of the committee when it was proved that just a day after my hon. friend from Halifax had moved in this House for a committee, Farr threw up a good situation in Toronto and went in to hiding. He admitted to witnesses that he was hiding, and he also admitted that he had voted himself twenty-two times at this election, that he had been furnished with a ticket and promised money to make himself scarce. He told four witnesses that he was in trouble over West Huron, and that whilst in hiding he was visited by, and did visit Mr. James Vance, the lieutenant of the Liberal organizer of the province of Ontario. Farr called on Vance, and Vance had a telegram from Ottawa : 'Keep Farr low.' This is what Farr told a witness who was examined in the committee. Farr also declared to the poll clerk, on the day of the election, with the candour that seems to

distinguish all these gentlemen, that he had put 'thirteen damned good ballots into the box.' I read the other day, and I hope it will be brought forward in this discussion, a letter from one of the officers of the Ontario government who is mixed up in the West Elgin fraud, which surpasses in candour even this avowal, and I hope that my hon. friend who has this letter in his possession will read it. It is a fine piece of scoundrelly, ballot thieving literature. A scrutineer standing near Farr, picked up a ballot from McLean, initialled by Farr. Farr snatched it and tore it up into pieces, and said it was nothing. That was the act of a guilty man. Goderich polling booth No. 2 was on the same street, immediately opposite No. 3, where Farr presided. At No. 2, Colborne, two ballots for Holmes were found to be forged.

With such revelations brought out last session in the committee, and with the declaration of my hon. friend, that he has fresh evidence, and can probe these things still further, can any one be astonished that my hon. friend the ex-Finance Minister, felt indignant when the Prime Minister took the position that he would do all he could to block the inquiry any further ? What does it mean ? It means this. It means that here we have a number of criminals worse than the majority of men in any penitentiary, for these criminals are striking at the life of free institutions. These ballot pluggers and thieves are worse than any criminals in the penitentiaries. My hon. friend from Halifax wants to get at them, and here comes dignity in its most attractive and powerful garb, the voice of the Prime Minister, who says : 'Stand back ; you must not touch one of these ; you must not inquire ; we will not help you to inquire.' That is a very serious stand to take. I say it destroys the efficiency of parliament. Talk about some little defect in parliamentary demeanour, talk about some little looseness of language, talk about some violent invectives—why none of these things, not the most violent invective heard within the walls of any parliament, could do such harm to the morale of parliament as for the Prime Minister to declare that he was going to stand by ruffians of this description and shield them from discovery. I would to God that a man would arise at this hour who would put into words that could not die, the shame, the rage, the scorn, the contempt, which every man who loves free institutions, must feel in our having a Prime Minister who seemed at one time capable of much better things, but who, under the influence of the sluggers and pluggers and the Farris in politics—Farris not in name, but in act—who have climbed close to the seat of power, has sunk so low that he will stand up here and declare in a brazen manner that his dignity stands in the way of allowing an inquiry into this rescaldom of Brockville and Huron.