

has been to corrupt representatives of the people and to corrupt electors; most of all, to invade the one thing that ought to be sacred in our politics—the ballot-box.”

Here was an opportunity for W. R. Brock, M.P., E. B. Osler, M.P., E. F. Clarke, M.P., A. E. Kemp, M.P., and other prominent Toronto Conservatives, to have their friends, the Conservative council and mayor, have an investigation—but they closed their eyes to it all.

Easy Money From a Tory Lawyer on Sunday.

Of the many reckless charges which the Conservative Opposition made against the Liberal Government since 1896, all of which were without any substantial basis, must be included the one re the West Huron (Dominion) bye-election, 1899. Every opportunity was given the Opposition to prove their charges, and scores of witnesses were brought to Ottawa at the public expense, but all to no purpose; although, the Privileges and Elections Committee exhausted every effort to aid them. The Opposition thought that as the ballot then used was in the same form as that which they operated with in 1896 there could not be honesty in an election. The Conservatives asserted that one Farr and others had switched ballots. An extract from the report of the proceedings in the House will show to what extremities the Opposition were driven to in the matter.

M. K. Cowan, (Liberal) M.P., speaking on the floor of the House of Commons, as reported in Hansard of May 17th, 1900, said:

“I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that he is still within the jurisdiction of Canada; I tell them that Farr was in Toronto, and is in Canada, and if this statement is false then they can arrest Mr. Farr. But they have not done it, and why? It is because the statement is true. It is because Mr. Mitchell, the town clerk of Goderich, a Conservative, a man appointed by the Goderich town council, swears that he saw Farr's ballot and that it was marked for Mr. McLean, the Conservative candidate in West Huron. I am not going to depend upon the evidence of a man named Farr; I am not going to ask this House to believe the uncorroborated statement of even Farr, even though he has not been proven a self-convicted liar and perjurer as Pritchett was.” (Reads affidavit of one Farr.) “That is the affidavit of Farr. I do not know whether that affidavit is true or not, but I do know, and every gentleman opposite knows, that Mitchell swore in the box that he was a Conservative. Mr. Mitchell holds the respectable position of town clerk in the town of Goderich; he goes into the box and swears that Farr is absolutely correct because he saw his ballot, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite have risen in their places, and have accursed at the idea that Farr voted for McLean. In making such a statement, these gentlemen opposite say that not only is Farr a liar, but that their own supporter, Mitchell, swore falsely when he swore to this circumstance which was within his own knowledge. Every man and every lawyer knows that when a fact is against the interest of a man, and he swears to it, then that can be given double weight because he is swearing against his own interests. Mitchell was swearing against his own interests and against the interests of his own party, for he knew he ought not to have seen Farr's ballot. But, sir, when it comes to scoring a point against the Liberals of this country, hon. gentlemen opposite have no scruple in saying that Farr is a liar, and that Mitchell is a perjurer, and that Farr was our special tool and voted for Holmes. Here is an affidavit with a minute particularity of detail that must carry the conviction of truth, as gentlemen opposite argue. Farr swears:—

“Thomas Marshall and James Nelson, who gave evidence before the committee at Ottawa, were not correct in their statement as to when they last saw me before giving their evidence at Ottawa. I saw them on the same day as they left for Ottawa, and was told by Nelson that they had got some easy money from Mr. W. D. McPherson, the lawyer, on Sunday afternoon, and that the said McPherson wished them to make a statement of their evidence so that he could take it down and post them what to say at Ottawa.

“I asked Thomas Marshall how much they had got, and he said \$26, with a promise to make it more if the evidence was good and strong. The said Marshall and Nelson have informed me since their return from Ottawa that they each got \$13.20 at Ottawa as witness fees, and as they were away ahead on the transaction they had each bought a new suit of clothes. Nelson also said that it had been a godsend for him, and he hoped he would get a chance to make another raise in the same way. He also told me that W. D. McPherson, just before bidding them good-bye at the train on the Sunday evening when leaving for Ottawa, had impressed upon them the necessity of telling a story that would look all right, and that if they did that he would not forget them.”