

reporters' gallery—especially in England—one session is equal to a session and a half of a member sitting in the House, because for one reason he is more there. Therefore, sitting there for seven years is equivalent to sitting in the House for ten years. I may say to you, Mr. Speaker, with great respect, that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) transgressed no parliamentary etiquette here to-day. What he was indulging in is what is called invective. You know, Sir, that so great an authority as Mr. Disraeli, afterwards Lord Beaconsfield, said: that invective is the great ornament of debate, and without invective our debates here would be very flavourless. If those gentlemen opposite, who sometimes indulge in that sort of thing which has distressed the soul of my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to such an extent that all the dignity in his soul is withered under the blighting influence of what he sees around him; if those gentlemen opposite would seek sometimes to indulge in invective instead of whatever indescribable thing they resort to, it would add greatly to the interest of our debates. Now, what was my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) saying when he was stopped? He was using language that attributed puerility or boyishness to the Prime Minister. And what did he mean? He meant moral boyishness. He said it because he considered that the reason given by the Prime Minister for not acceding to the request of my hon. and learned friend, was not a masculine or a manly reason, that it was consequently puerile, and he used strong language to express that opinion, and showed himself indignant—and we all felt his indignation—why? Because, Sir, the right hon. gentleman who is at the head of this parliament, and who is the keeper of its honour and efficiency, had pledged himself to a policy which reduces by 50 per cent—aye, by ninety per cent—its efficiency, as the great inquest of the nation. Why, then, should not a leading man on this side be indignant and vehement, and express his indignation, when the right hon. gentleman had taken a stand lamentable in regard to this parliament—and lamentable, I dare aver, as to the estimate the people of Canada will form of my right hon. friend?

Now, Sir, I want to ask the attention of the House for one minute to what occurred last session. We had in that committee room a meeting. Only five polls were investigated. The principal polls investigated, were No. 4 of the township of Colborne, and No. 3 of the township of Goderich. Daniel Cummings was the deputy at No. 4. There were 125 ballots to the ballot pad: 98 voted; there were none spoiled; and 27 were unused. 68 were marked for Holmes, and 39 for McLean; majority, 38. But of the 68 marked for Holmes, 14 were bogus—14 different from the 84 and 27, printed on different paper. An expert proved that the 14 were bogus; but it needed no expert, for

any man with half an eye, had only to look at them to see that they were bogus. But we had before the committee an expert, Mr. Harvey, whose evidence I have before me, and this man had with him an instrument called a micrometer, which he applied to measuring the ballots in the ballot pad, the ballot papers and the counterfoils. He measured these 14, and what did he say?

Q. And you have already given us the thickness of these ballots, 3—1 to 14. As a paper-maker you are familiar with all the processes of paper-making, are you not? A. Yes.

Q. Is it possible, I ask you, that these fourteen ballots came out of these stubs? A. No, sir.

Q. It is absolutely impossible? A. Absolutely. Then, later on, he was asked:

Q. You are positive, then, that not one of these ballots of series three, including one to fourteen and all between, could have come off these stubs? A. It is impossible.

Not only were these 14 shown to be bogus from their measurements, but they bore the initials of the deputy in ink, whereas the remaining 84 bore his initials in pencil. I was a member of that committee, and was present, though I took no further part than that of a juror or judge. But my hon. friend from Halifax, who conducted the case, assisted by Mr. Powell, showed by cumulative demonstration, that this man Cummings, instead of destroying the counterfoils, as he was bound to do by his written directions, was accustomed to put them into his right-hand pocket. What he did do, it is clear, was to put the counterfoil into his right-hand pocket, and out of an inside pocket take a ballot marked for Holmes.

Mr. BRITTON. There is not a word of that in the evidence.

Mr. DAVIN. There is not a word of that in the evidence? Have I said there is?

Mr. BRITTON. It is just made up by yourself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DAVIN. I will not trouble you, Mr. Speaker, to call the hon. gentleman to order; I will brush him aside myself. What I say is that it is a plain inference. How did these bogus ballots get into the ballot box? This is the natural surmise, that when he put the counterfoil into his right-hand pocket, he took out of another pocket the bogus ballot that he wanted to put into the box. Forty-one men who were brought before the committee swore that they had marked ballots for McLean. Two other voters, who were ill had sworn to the same effect before the county judge of Huron. Therefore, the real vote was 54 for Holmes, and 44 for McLean, 14 having been stolen, and this having been done with the deputy's connivance. Now, take poll No. 3, in the township of Goderich, where James Farr was deputy returning officer. Farr, like Cummings, put the counterfoils in his pocket instead of destroying