

"Where did you get it?" asked Mr. Whitney in some surprise.

"I had it taken in shorthand by a man than whom there is none better in the country," returned Mr. Davis. Mr. Whitney, in referring to the corruption, had said: "The men who counselled these things are professedly Christian men," and who "had sunk so low in the moral scale that they had done these

things," and had referred to Mr. Davis as "one of these professedly Christian men who would perpetrate these villainous acts." Therein he had sneered at Christianity. He had also referred to Cummings as a "protege of E. J. Davis." "Many men had been hung," Mr. Whitney had said, "for less crimes than those." Every hamlet in North York, Mr. Davis added, would know Mr. Whitney's statement, together with the statement he had to make in regard to it, and the result would not be satisfactory to Mr. Whitney or his party. (Ministerial applause.)

Mr. Davis concluded his address with a reference to his trip to Sudbury. The nickel law had been enacted in the Government's belief that it would benefit the country and result in the establishment of refineries here. Already plants were being constructed at Sault Ste. Marie and at Hamilton. There was also much to do in the way of colonizing the Province, and the Government intended to direct particular attention to those townships suited for it.

#### Mr. Whitney Replies Vigorously.

Mr. Whitney, on rising to reply, plunged vigorously into a discussion of Mr. Davis' position. He said he was sorry for his hon. friend opposite. The hon. gentleman was not himself, and never was less himself. As to Mr. Davis' report of the Newmarket meeting, Mr. Whitney declared that if he had reported him as saying Mr. Davis was one of those professing Christians who committed those villainous acts, it was an abominable and untrue report. He also denied that any of his remarks could be construed as a sneer against Christianity. (Opposition applause.) Mr. Davis had not, he declared, become seized of what the charge was against him. The charge against Mr. Davis was not that he had secured the reappointment of a deputy returning officer, but that he, a Minister of the Crown, had interfered between the righteous wrath of the returning officer and the misconduct of a deputy returning officer. Moreover, the Minister had admitted interfering at the request of Mr. Alex. Smith, the hub of the machine and the man who had brought in all the outsiders to the constituency. Apparently Mr. Smith knew the right man to go to. The Cabinet Minister should have resented at once as an insult the application from Smith to interfere with the returning officer, who occupied a sort of quasi judicial position. Whether or not Mr. Davis had any influence in reappointing the deputy returning officer, the result of the man's rehabilitation was seen in the stealing of 58 Conservative ballots in one polling subdivision in the Town of Berlin. (Opposition applause.) He defied the

Commissioner of Crown Lands to point to one drastic step which the Government had taken for the punishment of wrongdoers at elections. What the Government were doing was covering up instead of exposing the wrongdoing that had taken place.

#### More West Elgin Threatened.

Mr. Whitney intimated that the West Elgin matter might again come up for discussion before the session ended, and that more than once. He reiterated his opinion that the appointment of Mr. John Hoskin to the commission of financial experts was an indecent one. He was proud of the vote he had given against a railway to James Bay. The reason was because the House was absolutely in ignorance as to the route of the railway and its possibilities of success. As to the question of education, what he had proposed was that a consultative committee or advisory council should be appointed, and he had suggested that the members of this body should be selected by the teaching profession. It did not follow that the Minister should be obliged to accept the advice tendered. He was flattered that Mr. Ross had accepted his suggestion, even to the very name of the committee. The Attorney-General had maintained that Ontario could not legislate so as to restrict the manufacture of logs to Ontario, on the ground that it was in violation of the B.N.A. act, but what was Quebec doing to-day in the matter of pulpwood? Mr. Whitney affirmed that he had in the summer of 1898 advocated placing an embargo upon sawlogs, long anterior to the announcement by the Government of their policy upon the question. He also contended that at the session of 1898 Mr. Hardy, the then Attorney-General, took strong ground against the application of the manufacturing clause to licenses to cut Crown timber, although Mr. Gibson claimed that the Government had decided upon the timber embargo weeks before.

Mr. Gibson—Not as to current licenses.

#### The Failure to Prosecute.

There were lawyers in this House, Mr. Whitney said, who were as much amazed as he was to hear the Attorney-General say his department were not in the habit of instituting prosecutions in the Province. He contended that the statute provided that wherever an election court reported any person for bribery, it should be the duty of the Crown Attorney to prosecute him, unless the Judge directed otherwise. The Government spent large sums in prosecuting ordinary criminals, but in the case of West Elgin made no effort to carry out the salutary provisions of the law.

Hon. Mr. Gibson—I have told you that the prosecutions against known offenders were attended to.

Mr. Whitney—Bole and Cahill were the only two being prosecuted.

Hon. Mr. Gibson—Perhaps the hon. gentleman will favor us with the names of other guilty parties.

Mr. Whitney—He has only to look at