

the leader of the Opposition could frown him down when he wished to refer to him and his actions.

The Speaker—The debate has already taken a very wide range. There are many new members in the House, and I thought these charges had better take the widest range, and let every member say what he pleased to say, unless my attention was called. Now, the member for Dundas, as I understand him, says that he did not use that expression, and the members of the House are obliged to receive his statement. I think, however, that any member of the House can read what he has to read, but he is not permitted to express an opinion which would contradict the statement by the hon. member for Dundas.

#### **Inquiry Could be Broadened.**

Mr. Pettypiece said he had failed to find in the remarks made by the leader of the Opposition any reason as to why the investigation should not go on before the Judges. There was, he agreed, some difference between the two tribunals which had been mentioned. The Legislative Committee was not restricted in its inquiry, but a commission was limited to the facts mentioned in the instructions. He saw no reason, however, why the inquiry should not be enlarged to any extent that hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House desired. (Ministerial applause.) All they had to do was to put a plain statement into writing, as the hon. member for Manitoulin had done, and it could be investigated by the same tribunal.

#### **Charges Should be Specific.**

Hon. gentlemen opposite had for the past few years been persistently making insinuations against those on the Government side, and it was time that they came out and made their charges with specific details. (Ministerial applause.) The fair name of this Province had been besmirched more by the insinuations and innuendoes which had been repeated time and again within the House, than by actual deeds that had been proven or substantiated. (Renewed Ministerial applause.) He referred to the unseating on various occasions of Conservative members, who had been elected by means of personation or ballot-stuffing, and asked if there was anything on record to show that it had been proven that either ballot-stuffing or personation had effected the election of any member on the Government side of the House. But those charges had been repeated to such an extent that people believed there was something in them. The climax had come in the charges made during the week; the time had come when any hon. member who had any charge to make should make it definitely. (Ministerial applause.) If the hon. member for Manitoulin succeeded in establishing the charges he had made, he would deserve well for coming out straightforwardly; if they were shown to be utterly false, then he would be no worse than his leader, who had made similar charges, in an indefinite way, for the last four years, without having the courage to put them into definite shape. (Loud and prolonged Ministerial applause.)

#### **Cases Are Different.**

The leader of the Opposition had referred to the opposition which had been expressed by Sir Richard Cartwright to a commission of Judges proposed to be appointed by the House of Commons. But in that matter (the Caron investigation), if the hon. gentleman looked into that question carefully he would find that the circumstances were entirely different. The Judges who were to be selected by that House were their own creatures. (Ministerial applause.) The Judges in the case under discussion were not the creatures of the House. (Renewed Ministerial applause.) It was well enough to talk of patriotism and to use other such high-sounding phrases. They all knew, however, that any committee appointed would have a majority of one or two members of the Government side of the House; it would be a committee of diverse elements, sentiments and feelings, and would view the case from different stand-

points.

#### **Mr. Whitney's General Charges.**

Mr. Pettypiece went on to say that the Opposition made charges for party advantages and party purposes. A verdict by a House committee would not satisfy the country. They would be accused from every platform of having whitewashed a fellow-member. The leader of the Opposition was not even consistent in this matter. He had time and again told them that the majority of the Liberal members had been elected by corruption, personation and other improper acts, and now he asked the House to place an investigation of this kind in the hands of hon. gentlemen whom he had already said had been corruptly elected. Thus he would like to investigate a matter which in its importance was far above party consideration or advantage. His whole attitude, he was sorry to say, in this matter and in all this talk of corruption had been that he was more anxious to gain a party advantage than even to clear the name of Ontario from the charges of corruption. But if the leader of the Opposition was sincere that matters should be investigated by the Privileges and Elections Committee, in order that the matter might be cleared up satisfactorily, he was at liberty to place another matter in the hands of that committee, and that was the case of the member for South Oxford (Mr. Donald Sutherland), who was held by one of the trial Judges to have been guilty of personal corruption. If the leader of the Opposition desired them to believe him free of political taint, he should bring that matter before the committee, and have the stain removed or substantiated. (Applause.)

#### **Mr. Sutherland's Charges.**

Mr. Sutherland complained of the character of the witnesses in his case. Some of them, according to him, were not a very high-grade lot. That was the class of men who were likely to be implicated. Were these the class of people working for him? They were the only people they could go to for evidence. The hon. gentleman's inconsistency was shown by his having branded them as perjurers and liars, and then, dragging out their statements, procured afterwards, which he asked the House to believe, (Loud Ministerial applause.) The very nature of their statements showed that he was on very familiar terms with them, not only since the trial, but before. If they were a bad lot, it was not the fault of the man who summoned them, but of the man who associated with them.

Where did the money come from which was received by the Opposition candidates? Several of the respondents said that it had been sent from Toronto in amounts of five or seven hundred dollars in each case. Put it in the best light. Both political parties had political organizers, and they were necessary. It could not be said, nor was it right to assume, that in every case where an organizer went into a riding it was for corrupt purposes. The Opposition had their organizers, central and subordinate. They communicated with them. But it was not for him to say that that was done for corrupt purposes, and if those who made charges would find out that they were stating what was absolutely true or not, there would be fewer of those charges, and the name of Ontario would stand clearer than it did to-day.

#### **Differs from an Election Trial.**

In this case the honor of the Province, the honor of a Minister of the Crown, was at stake, and the investigation should be one in which every incident in connection with it should be probed to the very bottom. It would not be sufficient for the House nor the people of the Province that one or two charges in connection with it should be proven and the others not gone into. But every charge that the member for Manitoulin had made against the Provincial Secretary should be investigated, and no matter what the result might be either to the Provincial Secretary or the member for Manitoulin, the facts should be brought to light. It was a matter that differed in that re-

spect from the ordinary election trial. It was one in which neither party (hon. gentlemen on neither side of the House) should attempt to take advantage, to make political capital. If they derived political benefit from the result, well and good, but the one great object above all others was to get at the bottom of the charges, to ascertain if they were true or not. (Applause.) The charges were of such a serious nature that, though half the Province wanted to retain one party in power, and the other half wanted the other party in, those considerations should be of a secondary nature. He was informed by the leader of the House that no expense would be spared in hiring counsel or witnesses, and the fullest scope would be given to those who were anxious to get at the bottom of it. If the investigation were by a committee of the House one half would be interested in obtaining a conviction, while the other half would be interested in not obtaining a conviction. That would not be a satisfactory result to the Province as a whole. A more satisfactory result would be a verdict brought down by those commissioners who were away and above political strife, stress and bias, and who had no selfish ends to serve, except what every patriotic citizen should have in connection with the matter, the vindication of the political honor of Ontario. (Applause.) It would mean that a Minister of the Crown for the first time in the history of Ontario would be driven from public life for corrupt acts, or it would unearth a dastardly and deep-laid plot to depose a Minister of the Crown. But whatever the result, whether it would drive every Cabinet Minister from office, it was in the interests of the Province that the investigation should go on quickly and to the fullest extent. He trusted the House would see its way to sustain the commission that the Government proposed to appoint, and have the matter cleared up as quickly as possible. (Ministerial applause.)

Mr. St. John (West York) moved the adjournment of the debate, and the House adjourned at 5.20 p.m.

#### **Notes.**

The Press Gallery organized yesterday and elected the following officers:—President, C. C. George, The Mail and Empire; Vice-President, John R. Bone, The Evening Star; Secretary, H. W. Charlesworth, The News; Executive Committee, with above, C. W. Cavers, The World; M. O. Hammond, The Globe; Harry Passmore, The Evening Telegram.

Mr. Whitney will ask:—Has the Attorney-General any information as to when judgment may be expected in the East Middlesex election case? What was the date of the trial in the East Middlesex case? What was the date of the trial in the Sault Ste. Marie case, and what was the date of the judgment in the Sault Ste. Marie case?