

KERR SUPPLIED THE WHISKEY.

You know the reason I want to show that Kerr was there is because Kerr was the man that supplied the whiskey that froze on the road. Kerr was one of the chief spirits who supplied the whiskey at 12 o'clock the night before, although he was not in the whiskey business. Turn to page 235, and you will see that he helped to get the meeting together. Here is another question on page 235 by Mr. Cameron:

Q.—As to sending eatables and drinkables would that be necessary for sustenance?

A.—If they had not taken provisions with them, I do not know where they would have got them.

He not only met with them, and loaned money to them when the pile was run out, but he did more. After the election he was the paymaster.

Mr. Marter—Upon what page does it say that I loaned money?

Mr. Tait—Does the hon. gentleman doubt the evidence. I think I gave him the page before—page 233.

Q.—Had you anything to do with the getting of that money, or did Anderson bring it with him?

A.—He brought it with him. I let him have a little while he was there—not \$100. I lent it to him, and he has repaid it since. (Applause.)

Now, he also says in his evidence that he knew that Cameron got something, too. I refer to that because Cameron was one of the men with whom he negotiated, and to whom he had money to pay after the election was over. I think I have shown the connection of Cameron with the affair, but, if any more is wanted, I am ready to give further selections. On page 184, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Marter) will look at it, he will find that Cameron in his evidence:

Q.—What did you get? You knew what was in the cutter?

—They gave us bread and cheese and some whiskey, or what we supposed to be whiskey; there was more water than whiskey, I think; it froze on the road.

Q.—Where did you get this?

A.—I got it at Kerr, the baker's; I say there was more water than whiskey in the bottle, because the mixture froze on the road.

I might read from the charge of the judge, in which he refers to Mr. Marter, who would have us believe that he did not know what was going on in these words:

"That is evidence of this contest being carried on by funds supplied from elsewhere through these persons; by which these particular operations in question were conducted, and by which the other things which were thought necessary to be done were provided for, such as the paying for canvassing which was done by Marter with money supplied by Anderson and so forth."

What I want to draw attention to is not the question as to how the constituency was carried. Everybody knows that the judges held that it was carried by such gross bribery that not only was the candidate unseated but disqualified. It came out that Mr. Marter had nothing to do with the frozen whiskey brigade, yet he tells us that he helped to get the men together, to get men that did not live in that neighborhood at all to go in sleigh-loads from Gravenhurst and to swear that they were householders in respect of the land entered on the deputy returning officer's list; that they were entitled to vote, and that they had not received anything for their votes.

MR. MARTER'S CHALLENGE.

The hon. gentleman succeeded in getting men who did not live there at all to go and take that oath. It is as bad as the frozen whiskey business. To bring up this question is not the pleasantest thing possible, but when the matter came up the other day he arose and said that if the charge was proven he would leave the house, and, if not, that I should leave, so there was nothing left for me but to prove his connection with this frozen whiskey business. This would not have been a serious matter had it not been for the challenge he has thrown out that he or I should leave the house. I have no intention of leaving it, but he can follow that course if he chooses. But the house and the people of this province when they read the evidence will see that it discloses his connection with the whole affair, his connection with the brigade. It has shown his close connection with these people. If he wants to stand before the people as a moral reformer he will have to explain his position, because the case is fully proved.

Mr. Marter—Not a bit of it.

Mr. Tait—The hon. gentleman says: "Not a bit of it." The hon. gentleman said the same thing about selling Do-

minion offices, until I brought him the papers and proved it. I have shown from the evidence that that riding was carried by a band of organized bribers, who needed whiskey to fortify them, and that the hon. gentleman was acquainted with the whole plan. I have no more to say, except this: When speaking on a former occasion, he pointed his forefinger across the house, and said: "You will have to square yourselves with your churches and with your temperance societies."

Let me square myself on this matter; and if he can square himself he will be doing more than any other man could possibly do under the circumstances. He regretted having to bring this question up, but there was no help for it. He did not want to walk out without proving that what he said had at least some truth in it, and he would call now upon the hon. member just to take the best course that suggested itself to him, and he (the speaker) was prepared to leave the decision to the house, or to any other authority in the world, if the evidence did not show that the member for Muskoka was connected with that brigade, and that it was one of the worst and one of the most notorious organizations that ever existed. It was true that the judge had said that Mr. Marter had given his evidence in a frank, honest way, but many people believed that there was a purpose in this frankness, and that the hon. member believed that in the event of Mr. Fauquier being unseated the way would be clear for him to accept the nomination. He would rest his case on the evidence of the hon. member. He had not said anything but what was taken from his own words, and if he said that the evidence was not true, all that he (the speaker) could say was that it was enough to disqualify Fauquier and show where the hon. member for Muskoka stood. The hon. member boasted that he would not do anything wrong, but there was strong evidence that he aided in getting these men together, in getting them to forswear themselves, and was closely connected with those who supplied the whiskey.

MR. MARTER'S REPLY.

Mr. Marter said he was glad this matter had come up and he was satisfied that before he was through he would convince every one in the house that his position was the safest of the two. He had been through all this before, and the same wrong use had been made of the evidence given in that case. At this point Mr. Marter's temper got a little the better of his judgment, and he threw over at Mr. Tait the old charge that he was not representing the people but only himself, and rather sneered at him as a local preacher. If Mr. Tait, he continued, had only been present in the sleigh with those men on that memorable occasion he would very soon have put some of the whiskey where it would not have frozen, whereat the house laughed broadly. The hon. member for Toronto, he claimed, had only used such portions of the evidence as best suited his purpose, and he (the speaker) would have to bring to the attention of the house such portions as had been omitted. He read extracts to show that expenditures made were for the purpose of informing the electors of the date of the elections, of which they would otherwise have been ignorant. He also read his denial from the evidence of having been connected with the whiskey department of the brigade. The blame for such things, he said, should rest on the attorney-general, on account of the election law in force in the unorganized districts. The Liberals had run things with a high hand, and for the first time in 1883 the Conservatives had adopted the same methods. The oath administered that year could be taken by men who were residents of Gravenhurst and were taken to the unorganized districts to vote. (Laughter.)

Continuing, he pointed out that he was the only Conservative ever elected in that district, and had carried the Reform town of Bracebridge. This was something to be proud of, he thought, and he believed the people were satisfied that he had no connection in any way with the frozen whiskey incident. He made a religious appeal, that provoked more smiles than solemnity against Mr. Tait, who "preached the message of the gospel of peace," and brought this charge against a fellow church-member. The "gospel" appeal was followed by a charge that Mr. Maclaren and Mr. F. S. Spence were knowingly working in the interest of the Liberal party instead of the cause of temperance in advocating the submission of a plebiscite. In order to show the "utter hollowness" of the position of those who promoted the Dominion alliance petitions, he said they had distributed the plebiscite petitions among the members, so that, by presenting them one at a time, the house would be made to have an enlarged idea of their strength.