

the ballots. The judges so found; I have their report here, which I need not read to you, the matter is just as familiar to you as it is to me. The judges found that Wildfong and Cummings, another Government buttress, had manipulated ballots, had made false returns, had fraudulently defaced and injured 16, and that Cummings had fraudulently miscounted 21 ballots which had been cast for the Conservative candidate. The judges so found at the trial, and the Government were urged to prosecute these men. After a great deal of delay they did so, but before doing so the matter came up in the House, when they were again urged, and I have a copy of the speech of the Attorney-General on the question here before me, one published by themselves, and sent out to the country. Now I do not understand the moral obtuseness of anyone who would think that the Government's excuse was anything like a defence for these men, anything like a reason why the Government should not prosecute them. I will just read to you a little of the Attorney-General's speech in a pamphlet printed by the Reform party, circulated by them as their justification and excuse. "Wildfong's case, Mr. Gibson continued, is different; the defacing of ballots is expressly made an offence, but no direct evidence was given to incriminate Wildfong." Now, mark you this is from the Attorney-General who is asked to prosecute Wildfong. The judges say he manipulated those ballots, that he had tampered with them, that in the discharge of what should be a sacred duty, the taking care of the ballots of the people of this country, he had violated this trust, and returned the wrong man instead of the right man, and the Attorney-General, asked to prosecute this man, says on the floor of the House, and has it printed and published and circulated through this country in reference to this accused man, that no direct evidence has been given to implicate him. The judges who had tried the petition, were not trying the accused at the time, but found that there was evidence that these things had occurred and the election was upset in consequence of that, and the Court of Appeal confirmed the judgment of the two judges who tried it. And yet the Attorney-General says no direct evidence appears to have been given to incriminate Wildfong. "A process of exclusion of others who denied having any knowledge of alteration or defacing of the ballots seems to have led to the conclusion that Wildfong as a deputy-returning officer, must have committed the offence. My view is that further proceedings should be instituted." And yet he publicly announces before the prosecution was commenced, that there was no direct evidence to incriminate Wildfong. And what do you think happened? Can the people of the country believe it? That in that prosecution of a man charged with having manipulated ballots and switched them, that the ballots were not produced in Court, and the case was dismissed without the production of the ballots. Can one conceive of a prosecution by the law leaving out the very important evidence, the only evidence that could have been given, the production of the ballots themselves, and summoning the men who had marked these ballots to state how they had marked them, and showing that nobody else could have touched them but this deputy-returning officer. That is justice! If we heard that said of any other country we would say what an awful state of affairs must exist in that country; and yet men will be found so tied to their party that they will support the Government that has been guilty of this, that has so prostituted the law by asserting that they were prosecuting the man and yet not having the production at the trial of the very ballots that he was charged with having manipulated. So that the wicked Tories who prophesied that Wildfong would not be convicted were right after all.

A voice—What did they do with the ballots?

Mr. Foy—Well, the Government prosecutor did not produce them at the trial, that was the trouble.

A voice—They burned them. (Laughter and applause.)